UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

+ + + + +

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

+ + + + +

DESIGN FEASIBILITY OF NATIONAL TESTS IN READING AND MATHEMATICS MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1997

+ + + + +

The participants met in the Bernard Auditorium at 600 Independence Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., at 9:30 a.m., Acting Deputy Secretary Mike Smith, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

Mike Smith, Chairman

Sue Betka

Helen Chang

Joseph Conaty

Richard Dobbs

George W. Elford

Stephen Ivens

NEAL R. GROSS

PRESENT:

Elliott Johnson

Joanne Lenke

Daniel Minchew

Dean H. Nafziger

John H. Oswald

Gary Phillips

David Smith

ALSO PRESENT:

Calvin Jones

Adina Kole

Carlos Rodriguez

Larry Snowhite

Jay Urwitz

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

	Page
Overview and Purpose of Meeting	4
Legal and Contractual Issues	13
Design of the National Reading and	
Math Tests	18
Question and Discussion of Technical Issues	46

2	9:45 a.m.
3	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay, this is terrific. I'm
4	delighted you've all made it. I know it takes a hunk out of
5	your schedules and your planning and so on to pick up and just
6	come here for a morning. We are taping this, right? Just so
7	you know, we are taping it because this is an open meeting,
8	the comments everybody makes and the entire transcript will be
9	made public, it will be put on the Internet, so you will be
10	famous in 24 hours.
11	We are doing this because we want the entire
12	public to be able have access to it, so it's not just a
13	private conversation of any sort.
14	That doesn't I'm not suggesting at all that
15	you shouldn't be absolutely outspoken and, you know, say what
16	you mean, what you want to say. It's just to let you know
17	that it is being taped and will be public, and will be out
18	there quickly.
19	My name is Marshall Smith. I know a number of
20	you, but I think we should quickly go around the room although
21	you are going to be more knowledgeable about each other than I
22	am about you individually I expect.

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

1	I am the Acting Deputy now. I've been the Under
2	Secretary for the last four years here. Why don't we just go
3	around. Sue?
4	MS BETKA: I'm Sue Betka. I work for Mike.
5	MR. NAFZIGER: My name is Dean Nafziger,
6	recently of Education Testing Service in Princeton, New
7	Jersey.
8	MR. IVENS: I'm Steve Ivens and I'm with
9	Touchstone Applied Science Associates in Brewster, New York.
10	MR. CONATY: My name is Joseph Conaty. I'm with
11	the Office of Educational Research and Improvement in the
12	Department of Education.
13	MR. JOHNSON: I'm Elliott Johnson and I'm with
14	National Computer Systems in Iowa.
15	MR. SMITH: I'm Dave Smith and I'm with National
16	Computer Systems.
17	MR. OSWALD: I'm John Oswald. I'm with
18	Riverside Publishing Company in Chicago.
19	MR. DOBBS: My name is Rick Dobbs, I'm with
20	CTB/McGraw Hill, Monterey, California.
21	MR. ELFORD: I'm George Elford, a consultant
22	with A-C-T here in Washington.

1	MR. MINCHEW: I'm Daniel Minchew, A-C-T.
2	MS LENKE: Joanne Lenke, Psychological
3	Corporation, Harcourt Brace Educational Measurement, Sar
4	Antonio.
5	MS CHANG: I'm Helen Chang from the Contracts
6	Office here at the Department.
7	MR. PHILLIPS: I'm Gary Phillips, also with DOE.
8	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay, I'm going to turn to
9	Helen in just a couple of minutes and she will talk a little
10	bit about some of the issues that both the contractual
11	issues but also issues having do to with your whether
12	there is any constraints on your actions because of attending
13	this meeting. And I'm sure there aren't there aren't any
14	constraints, but she will do it in a little more legal terms
15	so that we can all understand it.
16	The purpose of this meeting is that we are as
17	you all know the President announced that there will be a
18	fourth grade reading test and an eighth grade math test. They
19	will be national tests and they will be, as Gary will describe
20	in considerable detail in just a few minutes, these tests will
21	be developed by through contract with us, by an independent
22	contractor

1	The idea then is that once the test is developed
2	and we've made sure that the test works in the sense of
3	meeting psychometric standards, that that test would then be
4	licensed to private publishers, to states, to local districts,
5	to whomever now gives out and does testing in general in the
6	schools of America.
7	So we are not going to sell the tests. We are
8	not going to give the tests to school buildings or whatever,
9	unless they actually do that already, they have their own
10	tests and they want to adopt this test for some reason. These
11	tests will be given for free basically. The Government will
12	cover the construction costs.
13	We will construct a new form of the test,
14	actually a large number of new forms, but they will put out a
15	new form for license every year. Not a new license, but a
16	continuing license.
17	There will be some standards under the license
18	which, pretty typical standards and we will get into a
19	discussion of that later on. So there is a new one every
20	year.
21	At the end of the year, that is at the end of
22	the testing period, whatever we need your advice on this.

1	at the end of that year we will release the test itself. It
2	will go out on the Internet to be available to anybody who
3	wants to use it. A home schooling mom might want to use it,
4	or dad, might want to use it with their children. Or a school
5	that hasn't participated in it for one reason or another could
6	pull it off the Net and use it for their students. A parent
7	could take the test and see what they think about it and how
8	they are working with it.
9	There will be a library of materials, also, or
10	the Net, around the test, which presumably would help teachers
11	and others think about the kinds of things that their kids
12	might need. Let's say it's a parent of a second grade child
13	takes a look at the reading test, the fourth grade reading
14	test on the Net. What are the kinds of books, and we are
15	going to ask the IRA, for example, to give us lists of books
16	that might be appropriate for second graders who are kind of
17	on course to do pretty well in reading on the reading
18	assessment, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. You can spin out
19	your imaginations on all the different leverage points that
20	exist in all of these things.
21	So the idea, the core idea here folks is not to
22	just put out tests. We already put out tests. We already put

out this. It is to put out, however, two markers that the
President is going to stand behind, that the Secretary is
going to stand behind and talk about and urge parents and
schools and communities all over the country to improve the
education of their children. To get them all to a point,
certainly all to a point where they achieve at the basic level
now, roughly benchmarked against NAEP, which the fourth grade
test will be benchmarked against NAEP.

The eighth grade test will also be benchmarked against NAEP. In addition it will be benchmarked against the In both cases we are now -- and Gary will explain some of the reasoning behind this -- we are going to go with the NAEP framework. Fourth grade reading NAEP framework and the eighth grade math NEAP framework, rather than the TIMSS NAEP framework is more elaborated. It is also a framework. little more appropriate for the U.S. We are, as you may know, equating the NAEP performance levels with the TIMSS and vice versa so that we will be able to have for the eighth grade test not just the NAEP performance levels but also student or school will know whether or not students in that school achieved at let's say the international average or the top ten percentile of students in the international test et cetera.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	The purpose of this meeting itself is to, early
2	on in the process, well before we put out the contract, this
3	will seek your advice, your sense. You are all experts in
4	this field, you do this stuff every day for a living and you
5	have met all these problems in many different ways that we
6	don't have any knowledge. We need to get that knowledge.
7	It's the second in a set of meetings that we
8	have held. We held one meeting with a group of people who
9	were experts in testing, people like Bob Linn, and experts in
LO	reading and math, people like Dick Venezky on one hand and the
11	new President of the NCTM on the other hand, as well as other
12	people. There were about eight or nine people all together.
13	So we reached out to the two content areas and
L4	we reached out to some testing experts to try to test our
15	ideas. Since this thing was only announced a month and a half
16	ago or so, we've been flying, Gary has been working almost
17	full time on this. For the purpose of this, Gary is working
18	for OERI, not for NCES. It's a distinction that's important
19	because NCES is not, under law, cannot construct an individual
20	test. So Gary does not work for NCES on this project. He
21	works for the other part of OERI, the part of OERI that's not
22	under that same law.

1	Joe fits the same thing. Everybody who is
2	working on this, the construction of this test is working for
3	OERI, not NCES. So if you ever get asked that question and
4	somebody points to the provision in the law, you will know the
5	answer to it.
6	Okay, I personally want to hear your concerns
7	and issues and sense about the technical side, the political
8	side, the time line, how it in some cases I can imagine,
9	how it threatens you, in a sense not as a personal threat but
10	does it threaten business somehow? Can we arrange it in such
11	a way that it doesn't give one group or another an added
12	advantage. Can we do it as fairly as we possibly can? We
13	don't want to screw up the market place out there, through the
14	introduction of this. That's not the purpose. The purpose is
15	not to have an independent test. It is to have it licensed so
16	it can be integrated into your mix of tests that you already
17	give or are planning to give.
18	Gary will describe the test itself which
19	obviously will be of considerable interest to you. He will
20	also describe the time line which you will see is very, very
21	tight. What's the date when we expect to have the RFP out?
22	MR. PHILLIPS: Probably next week or the

Т	following week.
2	CHAIRMAN SMITH: It will be the following week,
3	yes. We've got a couple of meetings next week as well as one
4	more meeting this week. So now is the time to get in any
5	input. Obviously, if you go back, if you go back home to your
6	home office or contact your home office I was going to say
7	in the long run we'd like to see technology used for these
8	tests, but it's not the right time to say it I don't think.
9	If you go back and you have you talk to some
10	technical folks and they've got some ideas or whatever that
11	you feel should be fed into us, just tell those folks you can
12	feed them in yourself or you can have those folks call Gary
13	and get the stuff into us. And we are seeking information
14	from wherever we can get it as quickly as we can get it. And
15	we know you will be a terrific help in that regard.
16	Okay, let me turn it over now to Helen for a
17	couple of minutes, and then we will go to Gary and get the
18	issues out.
19	MS CHANG: My name is Helen Chang and I'm a
20	contracting officer here at the Department. You all know that
21	we have a legal responsibility to see that the Department
22	fulfillment are handled in a fair and open manner, and in

2	As Mr. Smith said we anticipate that the
3	Department will need to enter into contracts to do the work
4	associated with both the development and the supporting of
5	these tests. In order to fulfill our requirements in FAR, we
6	need to make every effort to maximize our communication and
7	also to gather information.
8	While normally we don't talk about an announced
9	procurement prior to their announcement in the <u>Commerce</u>
10	Business Daily, we are required in the Contracts Office to
11	gather market research. We've announced this public meeting
12	here today and that's one of the methods that we are using to
13	because we don't want to say that we've got all this worked
14	out at the moment.
15	So that's really the purpose today is a frank
16	communication and also to gather information. Here at the
17	Department we do follow the principles, of conducting the
18	procurements in a process in a manner that is fair and open
19	and maximize our competition. We always strive to give as
20	much information as possible to potential participants and
21	have it given in an equal manner.
22	Because we anticipate contractual support and

1

accordance with the law.

1	the President announced we were going to do that, we want to
2	continue to that that in that way. And yet today we really
3	don't know the extent of what support we are going to need.
4	You can see there is a court reporter here and
5	today's discussion will be transcribed and we be putting them
6	on our Department's page in the Net so that any perceived
7	advantage of your coming and being invited and others of your
8	colleagues that couldn't, we hope we will minimize in that
9	respect.
10	Additionally, we do intend to hold some other
11	public meetings. The day that this one was announced in the
12	CBD, there is a meeting announced on Friday and there will be
13	another meeting announced next week. These will be held prior
14	to our issuing our RFP.
15	I am going to correct Mike Smith, we are not
16	issuing an RFP in two weeks, it will be sometime in April when
17	our time line is. As you are aware the <u>Commerce Business</u>
18	Daily requires that we do announce it 15 days before the
19	release of an RFP and we have not made that announcement yet.
20	We are also contemplating putting our draft
21	statement on the Web to get written comments from the public
22	prior to going anything final. We are also considering doing

1	a pre-solicitation conference prior to issuing a linar RFP.
2	And in these ways we want to get the public as well as people
3	in the community aware of our requirements, we are really
4	looking for your feedback in that as to what we have wrong,
5	how we can make this better.
6	These are all ways that, as a contracting
7	officer, I'm doing market research and enhancing the
8	competition. If you have any questions, I'd be glad to deal
9	with them now.
10	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any questions on this set of
11	issues?
12	MR. DOBBS: Is what you just said written down
13	somewhere, in terms of what you are doing and when?
14	MS CHANG: No, not the whens. As I said there
15	is a CBD announcement there was a CBD announcement
16	announced for today's meeting as well as one on Friday. There
17	is another CBD announcement that is being released today.
18	There will be another meeting next Tuesday, Tuesday 9:30 in
19	this room, and that will be a public discussion.
20	The others have not been announced because to be
21	perfectly frank we haven't settled on specific dates.
22	MR. PHILLIPS: There will be a press release

1	which I'm assuming will have these dates in it. I don't know
2	if it's gone out yet or not. Do you know if it's gone out?
3	MS BETKA: I think today.
4	MR. PHILLIPS: Okay, it will go out today.
5	CHAIRMAN SMITH: And you will see it in the
6	materials we hand out and also it will be up on the screen.
7	You will see some rough time lines on when the RFP is written
8	by and drafted for clearance and so on, it's all that sort of
9	stuff. We are all on real time at this point guys
10	MS CHANG: They are out
11	CHAIRMAN SMITH: On the other end we've got an
12	end point. We want to have these tests ready so they can be
13	administered in the normal spring administration of
14	assessments out there in the schools, in 1999. Two years.
15	MR. NAFZIGER: Will each of those subsequent
16	meetings in a panel format, as well?
17	MR. PHILLIPS: The next one will be, the
18	following will not be. Next Tuesday will not be.
19	MR. NAFZIGER: What is the Tuesday meeting? Who
20	are the
21	MR. PHILLIPS: The general public.
22	MR. NAFZIGER: The general public no invited?

1	MR. PHILLIPS: No invited.
2	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay? Gary, it's all yours.
3	MR. PHILLIPS: What I'd like to do is to hand
4	out a copy of the overheads that I'm going to be using so you
5	don't have to write down everything I'm saying. And while you
6	are looking at that, I'll field test this thing right here.
7	Okay, what I'd like is to spend some time this
8	morning basically going over the central components and design
9	of the assessment, talk about the time lines, any other issues
10	that might come up. We have plenty of time, I think.
11	By the way, Mike does have to leave, I think, at
12	11:30, so if you have issues for Mike Smith, make sure that he
13	hears them before he leaves.
14	So, but as you have questions please feel free
15	to ask them at any time. I know one thing that will happen is
16	a lot of your questions will be answered in the subsequent
17	overheads, but that's all right. But please feel free to ask
18	questions as we go along.
19	Let's start with some prior decisions that have
20	already been made. So these are really not things at this
21	point that we can talk about as being negotiable. As you
2.2	know most of this well the initiative same out of the

1	it was announced as part of the President's speech at the
2	State of the Union. So literally these sorts of things have
3	been decided by the President. And he is well aware of the
4	initiative and these are the thing that have been agreed to.
5	First of all the test will provide an annual
6	indication, so it will be an annual test that is intended to
7	be an indicator. Not a comprehensive assessment of math and
8	reading, but an indicator of overall proficiency in math and
9	reading. It will be at the individual student level, so it's
10	not like NAEP or TIMSS which are both, which both look at
11	groups. This will look at individuals.
12	It will be in reading at grade four and math at
13	grade eight. And it will be reported to parents and teachers
14	in a way that they can understand, method and text they can
15	understand. So this is a general intention.
16	Both the reading and the math test will provide
17	national standards from NAEP, those are the achievement levels
18	that NAEP has for reading and math. And will provide
19	international standards from TIMSS, that would be for the math
20	test.
21	Items will be released to the public every year.
22	The way we plan to do that, as Mike mentioned was to do it on

2	As soon as that shuts down the test, along with the scoring
3	guides and other things are released to the public.
4	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Not actually the items, just as
5	individual items which are often released for some of these
6	things. The whole test will be released.
7	MR. PHILLIPS: Right, the entire thing. The
8	whole booklet. And the first administration will be in 1999.
9	That's the one that gives me the most heartburn, but that's
10	life.
11	These are the givens and this is what we are
12	working with. So within these parameters we have a basic
13	design in place. And by the way, this will, of course, be
14	influenced by the responses to the contract, the RFP. So what
15	we have now is we are working on model ideas, but when we get
16	bids in things may change around as a result of that.
17	Okay, let's look at what the basic design is.
18	Yes?
19	MR. ELFORD: Are you assuming that the method
20	used in reporting will be the NAEP scale?
21	MR. PHILLIPS: No. I think what we will
22	probably do is have a metric that's more understandable to the

the Web. So there will be a window of administration time.

1	general public. I don't I'm not sure the general public
2	understands what 232 means on a NAEP scale. So we will
3	probably use a method like a domain score or percent correct,
4	or something that has a more intuitive meaning.
5	However, the test, like let's say, for example,
6	in reading, we would have two scores. One would be the score
7	on the test, expressed let's say in a domain score or percent
8	correct, and a predicted NAEP score. That would be in the
9	metric of the NAEP. Along with that you would get basic,
10	proficient and advanced to see which level this is
11	MR. ELFORD: So you would use the NAEP scale and
12	another score?
13	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes. And in the case of math you
14	will have the score on the test, the NAEP score and the TIMSS
15	score, predicted TIMSS score.
16	CHAIRMAN SMITH: And that will give you both the
17	NAEP performance levels, performance standards, as well as the
18	ability in TIMSS to say, you know, you are above the
19	international average or you are in the top 10 percent,
20	roughly.
21	MR. PHILLIPS: And these will be provided
22	probably in the form of look-up tables or something like that

1	to the licensed test sites so that when the scoring is done
2	and they get a score on this test, they go over and get the
3	predicted score on NAEP and/or TIMSS.
4	MR. ELFORD: And another related question. Are
5	you assuming that each licensee will create their own
6	reporting software and all that?
7	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, the reporting will be a
8	local option, up to the test site. What we are doing is
9	developing the test, making it available, providing guidelines
10	and requirements for its use through the license, and possibly
11	some monitoring to make sure that things are going well. But
12	the administration, the scoring, analysis and reporting,
13	except for the first year and if we decide to pay for teacher
14	years, will be the responsibility and cost of the license
15	site.
16	Now, one of the things I will mention here is
17	that in 1999 the plan is that the Government would reimburse
18	the license site for 1999, and then whether or not we do it
19	the following year is still a policy decision that has to be
20	made.
21	CHAIRMAN SMITH: This is important, I think. I
22	am always a little confused by this language, license site. A

1	state might be a license site. This is what he is talking
2	about. Or one of your companies might be a license site. So
3	it's not a site like a
4	MR. PHILLIPS: It's not like a school district
5	or building.
6	CHAIRMAN SMITH: And in 1999 the intent is to
7	reimburse you if you became a licensee for the costs of
8	administering and scoring that tests. And we will cover and
9	estimate how much that is. Right now we are looking at a
10	ballpark of \$5 to \$6 per student, which is maybe even a little
11	bit high, I guess. But that's the ballpark estimate we are
12	operating with.
13	The school districts in effect wouldn't have to
L4	pay you for that part of the test package that we give them.
15	We would reimburse them. I think, my guess is that the way we
16	are moving now just depends upon public response and a lot of
17	other things, the way we are moving now it looks as if that
18	1999 policy will be continued at least for a few more years.
19	MR. URWITZ: Federal reimbursement?
20	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes. Everything has been I
21	have been taking to Congress in a formal way and so on. So
22	there is all that uncertainty. But the first six months will

1	really determine how things are looking, how many states sign
2	on, and so on.
3	MR. URWITZ: And when you talk about \$5 or \$6,
4	are you talking about somebody doing a composite, in terms of
5	your reimbursement, a composite reimbursement for all the
6	functions? Or are they going to be divided up functionally
7	with some subpart of that for administration, some for
8	scoring, some for whatever other things?
9	MR. PHILLIPS: First of all, I'd like to say I'm
10	a little nervous to talk about budget at this meeting. I
11	don't think there is
12	MR. URWITZ: Well, how are you going to
13	structure it?
14	MR. PHILLIPS: I don't want to talk about
15	budget. There will what we do is the Government comes up
16	with independent government cost estimates and we have a
17	certain number of assumptions that are built into that. That
18	helps us plan. But in the end, of course, the bidders on the
19	RFP, they submit a budget and assuming that they are not to
20	terribly out of line, everything is fine. But at this point
21	I don't want to discuss in a public meeting budget questions.
22	MR. URWITZ: Let me clarify, I'm not interested

1	in budget. Are you going to divide up the functionality and
2	have potentially separate contractors for each of the
3	functional elements of it during the first few years when you
4	are part of the handling organization?
5	MR. PHILLIPS: Right now the plan is that we
6	would have three RFPs. One for reading, one for math, one for
7	the linking. The reading and math would be handled through
8	OERI, we are still looking into whether or not NCES would be
9	involved in the linking. One reason might be that NAEP and
10	TIMSS are responsibilities of NCES, so therefore we are going
11	to link the test to NAEP and TIMSS, NCES won't be involved
12	with that.
13	But those decisions haven't been made yet. But
L4	I think we are fairly sure there we are going to have at least
15	three RFPs. So everyone who gets the RFP, gets the contract
16	for reading would be responsible for all the nuts and bolts of
L7	it, including the development, the body of materials and the
18	license, things like that. Okay?
19	Let me mention a few of the basic elements.
20	First and foremost, this test is a voluntary test. The
21	Government is sponsoring the development of it and the
22	distribution and use of it, and backing its technical

1	integrity. But in the end, it is voluntary.
2	And in fact, the next one is there is no
3	identifiable data from the test administration that is even
4	given to the federal government, so we don't get data back.
5	So when the test is administered, let's say in the local
6	school system or school, the data goes to whoever has got the
7	license to administer the test. It does not come back to us.
8	We might, for example, like everyone else, get a
9	copy of a report that might be generated. But there is no
10	data that we are collecting.
11	Now, there will be some identifiable student
12	data that a contractor will have to have to develop the tests.
13	So that's part of the development process. Like in your
14	case, it's like it might be norming. If you do norming you
15	are going to be collecting data on individuals.
L6	So the same sort of thing would happen there.
L7	In fact, one way of looking at this is what we are doing is a
18	lot like your norming except we are doing it every year. Your
19	norming is much more extensive than what we are doing, but
20	it's sort of similar to that.
21	Okay, so there is no it's voluntary, there is
2.2	no individually identifiable data that will come back to the

1	federal government. The test will be consistent with the
2	standards, the joint technical standards, APA, AERA, NCME.
3	And as you know those are being revised and depending on the
4	status of those revisions, this test would be intended to meet
5	those standards as well.
6	There will be included criteria and appropriate
7	accommodations will be required. This will be one of the
8	things that we are working on now within the Department. Of
9	course, the contractor will have to deal with this. There
10	will be some guidelines as to what students, which students
11	should be included or excluded from the test, like for example
12	if IEP says it should be excluded then that might be one of
13	the guidelines.
L4	There might be some accommodations. In general,
15	what we are thinking is that the accommodations that the
16	school would naturally provide would be acceptable. There
L7	might be a situation where we would provide an accommodation,
18	like maybe a Spanish version of the test. I am not promising
19	that for the first administration, but it might be something
20	we can work toward.
21	Also extended time, things like that would be
22	obviously accommodations.

1	But in general it would be whatever the school,
2	the district or the state is used to providing in their own
3	testing program or provisions.
4	As I mentioned earlier, it's an individual test
5	in reading grade four, math in grade eight. The reasons those
6	subjects and grades were chosen is and Mike you can speak
7	to this if you like would you talk about that?
8	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Sure. First it's really a
9	testing of reading in English. We don't want to get in a
10	situation where we are expected to produce a test in every
11	language. So I think the focus is more narrow than reading in
12	general. It is reading in English that's number one.
13	Number two, on the fourth grade and eighth
14	grade. We wanted to pick, we wanted to choose areas in the
15	basic skills that were critical transitioning times in kids
16	lives. And you all know the data on fourth grade reading. If
17	you begin to fail by fourth grade in reading the relationships
18	to dropping out and so on are very, very powerful.
19	So, and in many, many schools in the United
20	States, people stop teaching reading around the middle of
21	fourth grade or toward the end of fourth grade. So this is a
22	transition point. If a kid hasn't made it by fourth grade, or

1	if a school is failing a large number of kids in reading by
2	fourth grade, the school isn't doing it's job, the student
3	isn't working hard enough. Whatever the reason is. Those
4	kids are put at risk, serious risk of failure in the long run.
5	Same thing is true in math at eighth grade. If
6	a student has been taking just calculations and arithmetic and
7	so on up to eighth grade, that student is not going to be able
8	to enter into the set of courses that really prepare them for
9	college. So eighth grade in math and fourth grade in reading
LO	really become transition points. They become almost make it
11	or break it points for students.
12	What we wanted to do is focus attention on those
13	particular points. We've had an America Reads, what we called
L4	America Reads effort which is being run by Carol Rasco who
15	used to be the Domestic Policy Advisor. We adopted for the
L6	America Reads effort the standard of a basic level in the
L7	national assessment. Every kid up to at least the basic level
18	in the national assessment. Right now about 40 percent don't
19	make it.
20	In this overall effort obviously we are
21	interesting in achieving that for every kid, we're also
2.2	obviously interesting in moving other kids up to the

1	proficient and to the advanced level. So we want everybody to
2	move up on this thing, but we want to create a base that's
3	really serious.
4	In math we've talked about a base that would be
5	the international average. So every kid above the
6	international average. That will turn out to be more than 40
7	percent. As most of you know that in TIMSS our average was
8	below the international average. And so therefore it's going
9	to be well over 50 percent.
10	So that is another challenging level, but on the
11	other hand, if you look at the kinds of items that you need to
12	pass to get to the international average in TIMSS, this is not
13	rocket science. They do not have to learn a lot of serious
14	geometry and algebra and so on, but they do have to learn some
15	problem solving that many of our kids now don't get, and some
16	ways of thinking about math.
17	And as Gary mentioned, one of the great things
18	about TIMSS when it came out, it had these wonderful linkage
19	to a body of research on teaching, on the content areas. It
20	was able to link them to the scores that other countries got,
21	as well as the scores that the U.S. got. Pointing out very
22	clearly that the U.S. has a different set of strategies for

1	teaching math and a different body of content in teaching math
2	up to eighth grade than do countries which score considerably
3	higher than the U.S.
4	Again, this is not new evidence to us. Those of
5	us who have been in the field for a long time know the body of
6	research over the last 20 years coming out of the U.S. points
7	exactly to the conclusions that we reached in TIMSS. But it's
8	underscored in TIMSS because of the existence of the horse
9	race, as well as the existing body of evidence.
10	So the fourth grade math and eighth grade
11	reading were carefully chosen. We don't want to get into this
12	game in a really big way, we want to use this as a way of
13	stimulating the standards effort throughout the entire nation
14	of saying, okay, the federal government believes that math is
15	math in Memphis or in Montana. And that the reading by fourth
16	grade is something that is an acknowledged goal for every
17	student in this country and you ask parents out there, you ask
18	teachers out there, you ask the general public, they respond
19	viscerally to this. They know they want every kid to read
20	independently by the fourth grade and they know they want kids
21	to be much more adept at math by the end of eighth grade.
22	I think we've got something that we can use to

1	really leverage reform movements in the United States in
2	serious ways based upon two subject matter areas that are
3	nearest and dearest to our public's heart out there. They are
4	non-controversial, fundamentally non-controversial areas and
5	we've got two good sets of performance standards to link them
6	against. So that the stars are in alignment basically.
7	We are not going to just depend upon the test to
8	try to throw that wake up call. The Department is going to
9	initiate very strong campaigns, basically, around reading by
10	the end of fourth grade or by the end of third grade and
11	around math by the end of eighth grade. And these will be
12	campaigns that will use groups like the International Reading
13	Association, the NCTM, all the measuring. We've talked to the
14	school boards, they are on board with this. We've talked with
15	chief state school officers, you name it, the educations
16	groups are on board.
17	But more that that, business groups are on
18	board, lots and lots of citizen groups. The Urban League,
19	Hugh Price is excited about this, we've just got a huge number
20	of different organizations and people that are really pumped
21	up about this and believe that this will really help the kinds
22	of reforms that are now going on in lots of placed around the

1	country.
2	So that was the reason for the fourth and eighth
3	grades. Substantive reason, a certain amount of political
4	reason behind it, it's political in a good sense. In the
5	sense of organizing people around a set of changes in
6	schooling that will really benefit an awful lot of children.
7	MR. JONES: Can you describe the contents of the
8	anticipated reports and the levels of reporting of effective
9	data you are not going to get any individual data back, will
10	you get any data? What sorts of reports on smaller
11	jurisdiction?
12	MR. PHILLIPS: Well, again
13	MR. CONATY: Excuse me, people need to identify
14	themselves for the record, please.
15	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, you need to identify
16	yourself for the record.
17	MR. CALVIN: Calvin Jones.
18	MR. PHILLIPS: Okay, it's a little early to talk
19	about reports. One is, again this is something that will be
20	dealt with by the contractor, but the other thing is that the
21	report is a local option. So different schools, districts,
22	states will be reporting in different ways. We will have some

1	guidelines around what is the appropriate use of the test.
2	But, I think it's too early to really say definitively how
3	this will be reported. The plan is that there will be a
4	report that will go to parents and teachers. Yes?
5	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Carlos Rodriguez. The points
6	Mike made regarding the transitionary period, periods before
7	take period are absolutely empirically correct. The item I'm
8	concerned about is how we link the inclusionary criteria to
9	that particularly in the case of disadvantaged and minority
10	children because there is a different set of premises that
11	affect those kids, depending on the kind of intervention model
12	that's been used up to the fourth grade. I want to simply go
13	on record as saying that's an issue that has to be a very
14	sensitive and deliberate attempt.
15	MR. PHILLIPS: That's very good. One factor
16	there is we are stating up front this is a test in reading in
17	English.
18	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes. I understand.
19	CHAIRMAN SMITH: But we are also working with WM
20	and a variety of other people on these same issues, and OCI as
21	well.
22	MR. RODRIGUEZ: My concern is that school

1	districts may be without really clear, explicit direction from
2	the beginning, may include all kinds of children in there
3	which then affect the results.
4	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Right.
5	MR. PHILLIPS: We will have explicit directions
6	for both inclusion and implementation. Okay?
7	All right, so in addition to the individual
8	tests for students, it is planned to have parallel forms from
9	year to year. This means that we are going to use the
10	technology that most testing companies use to equate one form
11	to another form so that the form in the year 2000 will be
12	equated to the form that was used in the year 1999. And if
13	you want me to get into the details of it, I can. It's
14	entirely up to you, but that will be the plan.
15	We also would report in an effort that's easily
16	understood by parents and teachers. And again, an obvious
17	first choice would be a domain score or a percent correct.
18	There might be another method that we might think about.
19	The framework would be the, the NAEP framework
20	has already been developed through a national consensus
21	process, is fairly well established and accepted. We would
22	like to use that framework for this test. We are sort of

1	using the framework the same way you can use the framework.
2	It's in the public domain and can be used for a variety of
3	purposes. We would use the framework to help us focus in on
4	the content of the test, but we would come up with a different
5	set of item and test specifications.
6	So that means the mix of items and things like
7	that might be different on this test than it would be on NAEP.
8	NAEP, as you know there are lot of performance type items and
9	they take a long time and they cost a lot of money. Here we
10	would not have that same mix. I'll talk about that in just a
11	moment.
12	This would be, the test that we are developing
12	This would be, the test that we are developing is a new test. It's not NAEP and it's not TIMSS. It's based
13	is a new test. It's not NAEP and it's not TIMSS. It's based
13	is a new test. It's not NAEP and it's not TIMSS. It's based on the NAEP framework, but it's not NAEP. In fact it may not
13 14 15	is a new test. It's not NAEP and it's not TIMSS. It's based on the NAEP framework, but it's not NAEP. In fact it may not even use NAEP items, it may not use TIMSS items. But it would
13 14 15 16	is a new test. It's not NAEP and it's not TIMSS. It's based on the NAEP framework, but it's not NAEP. In fact it may not even use NAEP items, it may not use TIMSS items. But it would be linked to NAEP through a linking process so there would be
13 14 15 16 17	is a new test. It's not NAEP and it's not TIMSS. It's based on the NAEP framework, but it's not NAEP. In fact it may not even use NAEP items, it may not use TIMSS items. But it would be linked to NAEP through a linking process so there would be a score on this test plus a NAEP predicted score and it would
13 14 15 16 17	is a new test. It's not NAEP and it's not TIMSS. It's based on the NAEP framework, but it's not NAEP. In fact it may not even use NAEP items, it may not use TIMSS items. But it would be linked to NAEP through a linking process so there would be a score on this test plus a NAEP predicted score and it would be linked to TIMSS. In the case of math there would be a
13 14 15 16 17 18	is a new test. It's not NAEP and it's not TIMSS. It's based on the NAEP framework, but it's not NAEP. In fact it may not even use NAEP items, it may not use TIMSS items. But it would be linked to NAEP through a linking process so there would be a score on this test plus a NAEP predicted score and it would be linked to TIMSS. In the case of math there would be a TIMSS predicted score.

2	Also, by the way, you as a testing company or a
3	state or a school district, just as we are linking the NAEP
4	and this new test, you can link your test, you are either
5	norming or in the process of norming and you can do the same
6	thing. You could imbed this test in your testing program. It
7	could be in a state testing program or local I'm not
8	talking about items.
9	I'm saying you could administer the entire test
10	and do the same kind of linking and get estimates of this
11	score from your test. They way we are seeing this is this
12	will make your test more marketable and more useful because
13	you can already get data from the norms from your test and all
14	the things you are doing with your test diagnostic
15	information and things like that.
16	But at least in reading in grade four and math
17	in grade eight, you can also get information from your test
18	about this national test we are talking about.
19	So there will be in the contract provisions for
20	making it easy for test publishers, state and local testing
21	programs to use this test to help you in your work.
22	We are shooting for about 90 minutes of testing

1

test to make it more useful.

1	time, which would be about two sessions. Approximately 80
2	percent would be multiple choice, 20 percent constructive
3	response items, including one extended constructive response
4	items. And that will turn out to be, we think, about half the
5	time would be spent, half the 90 minutes would be spent on the
6	constructive response items and the other half on the multiple
7	choice. That is of course a rough estimate because we don't
8	know what the items are yet, but that's what we think at this
9	point.
10	What we are going to be doing in terms of
11	developing the test is a three year assessment cycle. This
12	is, the assessment cycle will be part of the two RFPs, one in
13	reading and one in math. Let me show you what those look
14	like.
15	It will look something like this.
16	MR. CONATY: Gary, it's the next to the last
17	page.
18	MR. PHILLIPS: Right, next to the last page. I
19	was just skipping ahead here. The way this would work is,
20	let's take for example the year 2000 and let's see what is
21	going on in the year 2000. What we see in the year 2000, we
22	are administering the 2000 assessment, we are field testing

1	the 2001 assessment and developing items for the 2002
2	assessment. So all those go on simultaneously each year. And
3	we will get into a cycle where we are going the same thing
4	every year.
5	So in order to get to the 2000 assessment, we
6	start back here in 1998 with item writing and piloting the
7	items. Then we do the field testing and the linking. All the
8	linking is done a year in advance so that it's all ready to go
9	by the time the test is administered the following year. All
10	the linking, equating and creating of parallel forms, all that
11	is done one year in advance.
12	The reason for that is, of course it would be
13	more efficient to do it all at the same time, but we can't get
14	all the NAEP done and all that stuff done fast enough to get
15	this, get the linking done to get the scores out. So we
16	therefore are doing to do it one year in advance.
17	And also we are doing the linking to the NAEP,
18	the linking to TIMSS, the field testing, and then that gets us
19	ready for the following year which is 2000. And this is where
20	the licensees, this is where they kick in and they will do the
21	administration, in the year 2000, along with any scoring
22	analysis reporting to be done. Again, nothing comes back to

1	the government.
2	After this point, after, for the year 2000 after
3	the test is developed, we get no information back. We don't
4	like trying to get national data or state data from this test.
5	If you want that, you get that from NAEP, TIMSS. Okay?
6	So that's the general assessment cycle, it's a
7	three year assessment cycle. And in every calendar year there
8	will be three assessments going on at once. We are always
9	conducting one, field testing the next one and developing
10	items for the following one. Okay?
11	Let's look at the administration, scoring, and
12	analysis. This will be done by the licensed test site which I
13	need to get another term because it doesn't feel like it's a
14	building or something. It could be a state or consortium of
15	states, or whatever. We are shooting for the first
16	administration in April/May of 1999. That will become the
17	window, somewhere there, it will probably be like a two week
18	window or something like that. I just don't know when it will
19	be yet.
20	The administration will be carried out by
21	license test administrators. It could be test publishers,
22	states or school districts or others. The contractors, that

1	is the one for reading and the one for math, will issue the
2	licenses and they will monitor the licenses. Part of what we
3	will be asking bidders to propose is a way of monitoring
4	what's going on so that we can guarantee the integrity of the
5	assessment, that the administration is being followed
6	properly, the scoring, things like that, reporting. That the
7	accommodations, for example, are being provided, and
8	exclusions are according to the criteria we have, things like
9	that.
10	During the first year of administration, as Mike
11	mentioned and possibly subsequent to that, the government
12	plans to it says the contractor, but it's really we give
13	money to the contractor who then reimburses the license site.
14	So this is sort of seed money to get the test in use and to
15	get people used to it, things like that. So we may or may not
16	extend that into 1999.
17	The test administration will be consistent with
18	all civil rights laws, and of course the Individuals with
19	Disabilities, Education Act and other federal requirements.
20	And as I mentioned earlier, the test reporting strategies are
21	local options. So different districts might be reporting in
22	different ways. They may have different reporting formats,

1	and some might send a letter to the parents, some might send
2	different things. But we will have some guidelines and some
3	requirements there about reporting as well as the uses of the
4	test.
5	There are likely to be some uses that we will
6	not permit with the test. There will be many uses that we
7	would. All that has to get worked out between now and the
8	time of the first administration.
9	Any questions on this? You are an easy crowd.
10	Yes?
11	MR. MINCHEW: I wanted to clarify one thing,
12	your point number three. The contractor is the developer of
13	the test?
14	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.
15	MR. MINCHEW: The licensee could be a school
16	district or a company.
17	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.
18	MR. MINCHEW: Would you envision that a
19	contractor would also be a licensee in some circumstances?
20	MR. PHILLIPS: That's a possibility, but I would
21	have to think it through. I don't know.
22	MR. CONATY: These and other kinds of issues we

1	need to think about as we think about that.
2	MR. MINCHEW: And the fees would be paid to the
3	contractor who would then reimburse the licensee? Am I
4	understanding that correctly?
5	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, that's the current plan.
6	Again, if the legal/financial arrangements we still have to
7	work out. If that's the way it goes, that's the way it would
8	be. I suspect that's the way it will go. But something else
9	might happen between now and then to change that. That
10	somehow the money would go from the government to the
11	licensee.
12	MR. MINCHEW: To the licensee who would then pay
13	the contractor?
L4	MR. PHILLIPS: No. For example let's say you
15	are a company, Company X, and you've got the contractor to
16	develop reading. Part of your contract is that you will
17	provide this test to schools, districts, states, others in the
18	country, under a license-type arrangement.
19	Okay, now, that's let's say now that you have
20	a school district that wants to use this, Philadelphia, let's
21	say. So they use, they want to use the test and they get a
22	license, so there are a certain number of written requirements

1	they have to agree to. Okay, now part of the ficensing
2	agreement is they have to show that they have sort of
3	corporate capability or the capacity to do all the things they
4	have to do on this test.
5	They could do it through contracts. For
6	example, this school district could contract with another
7	company. They might be able to contract with the company that
8	developed the test. We will try to make it as fair as
9	possible so that we spread around the work. Or they might
10	have an in-house capability of doing it. They might have the
11	teachers, the staff, the expertise to do this themselves.
12	That will vary. That has to be part of what the contracting -
13	- what the company does, it develops tests. They have to be
14	able to make a decision about that license use and to monitor
15	it.
16	MR. MINCHEW: And let me see whether I
17	understand this. There will be an RFP to develop the test.
18	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.
19	MR. MINCHEW: Two or three?
20	MR. PHILLIPS: Three, right, two to develop it
21	one for linkage.
22	MR. MINCHEW: And then there will be a separate

1	reimbursement item for districts that elect to use the test?
2	MR. PHILLIPS: In 1999 and maybe beyond.
3	MR. MINCHEW: Yes.
4	MR. PHILLIPS: But after that, once we decide,
5	or if we decide not to reimburse the license administrator,
6	then that cost is paid for by the school districts.
7	MR. MINCHEW: That use it.
8	MR. PHILLIPS: That use it, that's right.
9	MS CHANG: What problems do you see with that
10	plan?
11	MR. MINCHEW: Making it clear that the
12	reimbursement is going to be available from the department and
13	probably because I think districts would like to think of
14	longer range planning, some indication of what the prospects
15	will be for future years.
16	CHAIRMAN SMITH: That's a very good point,
17	general point. The two points together is and we've got to
18	make a final decision on that. We have a different problem
19	than you folks do. As you know, we have to go to Congress,
20	and Congress is going to have to bless this. So, I think we
21	will know a lot more in the next two and a half months.
22	MS CHANG: We need to make this type of thing

1	clear in the RFP.
2	MR. MINCHEW: Yes.
3	MR. PHILLIPS: Go ahead.
4	MR. OSWALD: I see actually a bigger problem
5	with it than that. Theoretically will this contractor, the
6	reading contractor for example, which let's say could be one
7	of us in this room or someone else, also have the job of
8	determining the fitness and the terms for which the licensees
9	can be approved or not? Or will that be done by the
10	department?
11	Because if it's the first, in essence what you
12	could do is create a situation in the competitive market place
13	where a contractor would have control over their competitors
14	ability to participate in the program. And I think that could
15	run you into trouble with anti-competition rules. You
16	actually are there meddling into the market place issues.
17	The only way I can see to avoid that, there may
18	be other ways, there might be some pretty smart people in the
19	room who can figure this out, is to either prohibit the
20	contractor from doing any licensing at all, from actually
21	being a licensee, or making sure that the nature of the
22	contractor is not in the nature of being a competitor to the

1	possible licensees. Which is a very difficult thing to do
2	because most test publishers are very different in terms of
3	the range of services that they provide. Many of them will be
4	capable of either bidding on both or one or the other of
5	these.
6	Then, to kind of complicate it further, the
7	decision making process as to who is an authorized licensee
8	would be very, very touchy if you are putting it in the hands
9	of a competitor. I mean think of it in another area. It
10	would be like letting General Motors decide whether Ford is
11	fit to distribute trucks that are developed under a different
12	contract and you have a problem there, to not approve Ford for
13	various reasons, once you restrict the competition.
14	MR. JOHNSON: That extends to the monitoring
15	also, even if you got the license.
16	MR. OSWALD: Right, exactly.
L7	MR. JOHNSON: The monitoring would kick in the
18	same way. You are now asking one competitor to monitor the
19	performance of another.
20	MR. OSWALD: And then it could go further
21	relative to one of the issues that you didn't discuss, and
2.2	if this is a budget issue then stop we won't talk about it.

1	but there is the issue of pricing in the final market place.
2	When this product finally gets delivered, especially if you
3	allow options, which by the way I welcome as a, you know, as a
4	company, that publishers can enhance this test with other
5	tests of their own. It becomes an issue of pricing. What is
6	are you going to allow the licensees to set prices for
7	school districts? Especially if we go into the situation
8	where the government is not paying for it. In which case do
9	you allow the normal rules of the competitive marketplace to
10	exist, which is every company sets the price for the national
11	reading test administration and score reports independent of
12	other companies. In which case school districts can elicit
13	competition among those licensees to see who gets the price
14	and who gives them the best package.
15	And then what flow of money back to the final
16	licensee is controlled by this contractor, competitor
17	possibly, who is in charge of the entire operation? So
18	theoretically, let's say, you know, we start with a number
19	like \$6 a student is what the federal government thinks is
20	appropriate to reimburse. The contractor of the reading test
21	marks that up and basically expects to collect \$7 a student
22	from every school, for example, who participants. So that

1	there is some profit in there for the licensee. This brings
2	up the whole area of whether or not you are going to allow, in
3	terms of using the free enterprise system to deliver this
4	program, are you going to allow for profits?
5	Are you going to allow for a mechanism so that
6	price setting can take place in the competitive marketplace?
7	Or are you simply going to say, here is the rule, we give you
8	\$5, you can only collect \$8 from every school per student, and
9	you can't charge more you can't charge less, and anyone who is
10	in this deal gets \$3 per student as a profit or to cover
11	overhead expenses, and so forth.
12	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Right, those are all very good
13	questions and we've got to grapple with them. The last one of
14	course, even if it was a fixed price for that test, if that
15	test is only a small part of the whole battery of tests you
16	are giving, you could mark up the battery. So you've got a
17	lot of flexibility in that context.
18	But we haven't thought through this set of
19	questions and we need to do it. It's, particularly the part,
20	they are all important, but the general theme that the
21	contractor could be a competitor and therefore could put
22	themselves, advertently or inadvertently at an advantage.

1	MR. NAFZIGER: There is a subtheme to that one
2	which is that the contractor, if you put the contractor in a
3	position of licensing jurisdictionally school districts for
4	example, that puts them in a position of enforcement and
5	monitoring over their customers. Which is a very
6	uncomfortable, could be an uncomfortable relationship. So I
7	think you have to think that through.
8	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, this is excellent.
9	MR. IVENS: On the reimbursement to individual
10	sites through the contractor, there may be reasons relative to
11	marketing of these tests themselves and getting the public to
12	buy into them, that it makes sense for the first year, first
13	two years or longer for there to be no cost to the end user of
14	the test. My experience, however, is that when there is no
15	cost to the end user, there is also no reason for them to take
16	it seriously.
17	I'd much rather see it subsidized to the end
18	user, but they have to invest something. If the end user
19	doesn't have any investment in it, they tend not to administer
20	it as well, take it seriously, teachers may not have
21	incentives for the kids to do well.
22	CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think that's a good point.

1	On the other hand, this is going to be a test unlike any other
2	test that there has ever been. This will be a test talked
3	about by the President for the full two years before the test
4	is given. So there is going to be a lot of hype around this
5	thing and when you hit the spring of 1999 there is going to be
6	a lot of school board people looking over the shoulders of
7	superintendents. So we are liable to get actually more, I
8	think in the long run your principle is exactly right, you get
9	what you pay for in effect. But, this one is also going to
10	have this special characteristic to it that we've all got to
11	think about and try to anticipate the problems.
12	MR. IVENS: If there were government
13	reimbursement up to X
L4	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Right.
15	MR. IVENS: But the total cost is Y and the
16	different had to be covered by the local school site, even if
L7	that amount is minimal, I think it gives a different message
18	than to say whatever those costs are the government will
19	reimburse you for them. I think
20	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes, go ahead.
21	MR. SMITH: Mike, relative to Dave Smith.
22	Relative to the motivation issue that Steve was raising, I

1	think. At what level do you see the voluntary nature of this
2	test? Is it voluntary at the state level? Voluntary at the
3	district level? Voluntary at the individual student level?
4	Or voluntary at all three?
5	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Basically, this is a test
6	think of this as like one of your tests. They are like a
7	state assessment. So it depends upon the state's decision
8	about that depends on the local district, let's say if you are
9	selling to New York or Chicago, whatever. If they are
10	allowing schools to have it as voluntary. If they are, so be
11	it. I think the level that we would prefer not entirely
12	voluntary, prefer, but we are going to have some guidelines
13	for is inclusion.
14	Once you've decided the school area, you know,
15	the Theodore Roosevelt school is going to be in this thing,
16	you've got to follow some rules about inclusion. But that's
17	normal testing practice and it's just good practice.
18	At the other levels of voluntariness are the
19	same levels that you deal with right now when you are dealing
20	with a client.
21	MR. NAFZIGER: Can I bring up a little different
2.2	issue? On the release of the test after it's administration.

1	via Internet or some other method, along with scoring keys,
2	interpretive materials and the like, might that not conflict
3	with current or possible revised test standards of APA and CNE
4	and AERA?
5	CHAIRMAN SMITH: That's getting very close to
6	the kind of testing by mail, although Internet is a different
7	mechanism. But that's always been frowned upon in the test
8	standards. Although I do know now you can download off the
9	Internet IP tests to administer to your own kids. And APA has
10	not spoken out about that yet, but they may. Others have.
11	But this idea of unqualified people
12	administering tests and interpreting the tests for their own
13	children or others, I just think it's a sensitive issue. I
14	don't know what tests fits there are and I'm not familiar
15	enough with the revisions of the test standards, but I think
16	it could be a red herring that you can talk to some people
17	about that.
18	MR. NAFZIGER: I've talked to at least one
19	person who is a chair that wasn't I guess still is a chair
20	of the revised standards, about this. But not specifically
21	about that issue. I mean, she does know about the general
22	intent to release them. So okay that's interesting, that's

1	interesting.
2	MR. JOHNSON: Elliott Johnson. If you license
3	at the school level, school district level, or school level,
4	the contractor is likely to have hundreds, if not thousands,
5	of licensees. Can anybody possibly monitor that many?
6	CHAIRMAN SMITH: I agree and I'm not sure if
7	we've fully thought that through. It's clear states, it's
8	clear big districts, it's clear for you folks and folks like
9	you. Whether it's an individual school or whatever, I think
10	is a different problem. They normally don't they also
11	don't have the expertise to be able to provide the information
12	
13	MR. JOHNSON: Well you bring a burden to the
14	contractor that he could not possibly
15	MR. PHILLIPS: I don't know very on point we
16	have not said this would be something we'd give to schools,
17	and it might be some criteria that a school district would
18	have to have. For example, if it's a school district of one
19	school, that's, you know, probably not a good idea. But
20	that's stuff we have to work through.
21	CHAIRMAN SMITH: And as you all know, there are
22	lots of school districts with one school. Certainly one

1	school per grade level.
2	MR. JOHNSON: And your you will hear from them
3	if the license is a big one
4	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Right, you might.
5	MS LENKE: And also infringe copyright, have you
6	considered this?
7	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, that's right. We do have to
8	consider that. That again is one of the challenges in
9	developing the test is that it needs to be as authentic as
10	possible, but not infringe the copyright laws.
11	MS LENKE: I mean copyright the test itself.
12	MR. PHILLIPS: Oh.
13	MS LENKE: This license requires in this case
14	the contractor would own the copyright. That's typically how
15	this works. So whether
16	MR. PHILLIPS: I don't know about that. We, for
17	example, the NAEP test is not owned by ETS, I'm sure it's not.
18	MS LENKE: I mean it doesn't have to be owned,
19	but the material does need to be copyrighted if in fact there
20	is going to be a license.
21	MR. PHILLIPS: That's probably right, yes.
2.2	MS LENKE: To produce it and

1	MR. PHILLIPS: Right, they licensed in some way.
2	MS LENKE: So it's in the public domain.
3	CHAIRMAN SMITH: We have to convey the license
4	in some way. It's public domain property, the licensee.
5	MR. PHILLIPS: After the release it's in the
6	public domain.
7	MS LENKE: Right, but not prior to.
8	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Not prior to the release.
9	MS LENKE: And a few items as well need to be
10	copyrighted.
11	MR. OSWALD: Another issue relative to the fact,
12	Gary, that you said that there were, there is no intention to
13	have any state or national reports.
14	MR. PHILLIPS: Right.
15	MR. OSWALD: Now that doesn't mean that the
16	state who decides to mandate it won't require from won't do
17	themselves, you are basically saying you are not requiring
18	them.
19	MR. PHILLIPS: Right.
20	MR. OSWALD: Are you prohibiting national
21	reports once this data is available and once the test is
2.2	available especially on the Internet there is really nothing

1	to prevent some agency, some publishers, some contractor
2	somewhere from going out and norming it and producing
3	nationwide results on it and, you know, for whatever business
4	reason they might have to do so. Are you also going to
5	prohibit that or basically if somebody wants to do that, it
6	will be no different than a company doing research on the use
7	of Title I funds or anything else like that?
8	MR. PHILLIPS: Okay, well first of all the
9	company that gets the reading and math test will be doing it
10	themselves. They are going to take a national sample. So
11	there will be some norming there. That's going to go on every
12	year.
13	But, to answer your question directly, if you
14	are a company and you wanted to take this test and do your own
15	norms and make a report on that, I don't see what would
16	prevent you from doing that.
17	MR. OSWALD: Okay policy is the only thing
18	that could prevent it.
19	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Either as a company or as a
20	researcher you might go out and gather data from some random
21	collection of schools or, just sample of schools.
22	MR. OSWALD: Okay, so you did say then the

1	company that will be the contractor will be norming the test
2	scores.
3	MR. PHILLIPS: Oh yes.
4	MR. OSWALD: So in essence it's theoretically
5	possible that one of the scores that could be provided on the
6	test is a percentile rank.
7	MR. PHILLIPS: That's possible, that's if we
8	we have to sort of decide if we are going to come down on the
9	area of criterion referenced scores and norm reference scores.
10	MR. OSWALD: Right.
11	MR. PHILLIPS: And that would determine in part
12	the sampling and issues and details of distribution and things
13	like that. That all has to get worked through as part of the
14	contract award. But there will be a national sampling
15	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Why don't you go through that,
16	links to the NAEP and TIMSS because that's an important part
17	of the whole development process.
18	MR. PHILLIPS: I don't have an overhead on it,
19	so let me give you that. Does anyone know if
20	anybody have a magic marker, great. What we will do is
21	something like this. Let's say in 1998, 1999, a year from
22	now. In 1998 we will have a set of field tests developed, I

1	don't know how many but I'll just, as an example, say six.
2	And so each of these are forms which will be as parallel as
3	possible given that we haven't had a field test yet because we
4	are going to do it this year.
5	We will get a simple form, get them as close as
6	we can get them, field test them, equate them so that they are
7	all in the same entry and in addition to that, link them to
8	NAEP-TIMSS, and with all that information make a decision as
9	to which form we want to give in 1999. So we therefore, let's
10	say it's this one, and so this is the one we end up giving in
11	1999.
12	Now, in addition in 1999 we are going to be
13	field testing for the year 2000. So there will be another set
14	of forms that we are going to use in 1999 so after this
15	test is administered, this drops out and goes to the World
16	Wide Web and is then used by the general public and others.
17	So let's say, for example, here this form has
18	problems and we fixed up the problems and now we are going to
19	readminister it again in 1999 and start again with this one.
20	So these are now varied forms and we will keep working each
21	year making the forms and when there is a perfecting form we
22	will fix it up.

1	So now what we want to do is we want to choose
2	all these, all of these forms are equated to this test. So
3	they are all the same entry as this test. So we are going to
4	be so in preparation for the year 2000 we are going to be
5	doing equating in the year 1999 and so we select one of these
6	forms. Let's say this form has a problem and we fixed it up
7	as the one we are going to use and that becomes the one we use
8	in the year 2000. And the process keeps going.
9	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Now they are also going to NAEP
10	every year.
11	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes. The NAEP is proposed in
12	addition to this is the national math test and the national
13	reading test and then in addition to that, the NAEP assessment
14	will be run every year. It will be, the plan of the redesign
15	is to have NAEP in the field every year, it will be for
16	example, the national math test and the national reading test
17	that will be connected with NAEP.
18	And we will do similar things with TIMSS
19	assessment as well. Yes? Somebody had a question.
20	MS LENKE: Can I make a comment?
21	MR. PHILLIPS: Sure.
22	MS LENKE: I don't think in terms of the testing

1	construction that that's probably the best way to go in terms
2	of thinking that an intact field test form will survive to be
3	a live test form. The purpose of field testing is obviously
4	to identify, you know, how the items are working and so forth.
5	And at least in my experience, I've never been in a situation
6	where all the items in a field test form worked.
7	MR. PHILLIPS: Right.
8	MS LENKE: So, I would advise at least, perhaps
9	you can use most of what's in a form, but that there is going
10	to have to be some selection from other field test forms.
11	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, there is also, for example,
12	1999 is one of the we are field testing for the year 2000
13	but item development will so it's another year in advance
14	where the items are assembled and worked out. And the next
15	year is looking at the forms. But you are right there will be
16	situations where you are going to have to do a little tweaking
17	of tests.
18	MS LENKE: Especially the first year.
19	MR. PHILLIPS: Right. But in time what will
20	happen is we will have a collection of forms that look pretty
21	good, and so I think the first year is going to be the
22	difficult year.

1	CHAIRMAN SMITH: This is important, this is real
2	important, obviously. Does it look reasonable? It will all
3	be noted, that's a good point. Obviously the first year is
4	going to be hard.
5	MR. ELFORD: This is so your national norming
6	is actually relating the committee?
7	MR. PHILLIPS: No, what we are going to do is
8	MR. ELFORD: Are you going to do additional
9	norming?
10	MR. PHILLIPS: Well, what we are going to do is,
11	these will be administered, let's say, this year, to a
12	national representative sample, okay? So then
13	MR. ELFORD: All of those froms?
14	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes. There is an issue here,
15	there is a technical issue. We have a choice of doing the
16	linking and equating in the year we do the administration, or
17	a year in advance. If we do it in the year of administration
18	the trouble is it takes NAEP too long to get its work done.
19	Even though NAEP will be administered in February, it cannot
20	get the scoring and everything done by April or May in order
21	to have the linking.
22	The same thing will be true with TIMSS. When we

1	readminister TIMSS, you cannot get all that work done in time.
2	You will have enough time if you do it a year in advance. So
3	there are, this is the way we are looking at it now, but
4	again, of course, this will have to be taken up as part of the
5	RFP bid. And there might be better ideas for this.
6	One way of doing it is to do the linking and
7	equating a year in advance so everything is ready to go so
8	when you hit the street in April or May in the year 2000
9	you've got a test form that's connected to NAEP, connected to
10	TIMSS from the previous year.
11	CHAIRMAN SMITH: So your norms, norms is the
12	basis for the national sample, then you also are equating it
13	back or linking it, whichever the correct term is, back to the
14	NAEP and back to the prior testing. So it's just multiplicity
15	of different ways of linking it and thinking about scoring.
16	MR. PHILLIPS: We are equating a new test to the
17	old test and linking to NAEP and TIMSS. Yes?
18	MR. JONES: Tom Jones again. Can you explain
19	the logic of field testing six intact forms rather than item
20	goals?
21	MR. PHILLIPS: No, we would field test the item
22	goals from the previous year, 1998. So for the year 2000, I

1	don't have a draft up here, but you are also going to have a
2	sample, a large sample. There will be item writing and
3	curriculum need for the year 2000 and there will be an item
4	pilot. So the items will be piloted. And you will get
5	statistical data on the items, to test simple on the form.
6	Now, let's say that we get to a place where,
7	let's say in 1999 try as we did, there aren't any forms
8	showing linkage points. Some items will need to be deleted or
9	something goes wrong, you can't find the form. Well then we
10	resort to what most testing companies resort to, equating that
11	to where the we make instead of reporting like for
12	example, if we go to a domain score, that becomes something
13	that we can deal with statistically better rather a percent
14	correct. It might be we have trouble with a percent correct,
15	anticipating that problem you might want to achieve, for
16	example, domain scores, as a way of reporting.
17	Again, these are issues that have to be dealt
18	with by the contractor, and there are a whole bunch of these
19	things, psychometric issues.
20	MR. IVENS: If you believe in the stability of
21	the NAEP scale and the ability of NAEP assessment from one
22	year to the next to be equated to each other, if you believe

1	in the equating of the national reading test or the national
2	math test from one to another, couldn't you simply fix the
3	relationship between the national reading and the national
4	math and the NAEP scales once?
5	MR. PHILLIPS: Okay, that's first of all
6	MR. IVENS: Before you answer my question, the
7	downside of this model is that whatever the relationship that
8	is between one and another, if you keep re-establishing it
9	every year, you are going to have links jumping all over the
10	place.
11	MR. PHILLIPS: To me, this is a technical
12	assessment a little beyond this meeting, but I think you have
13	two choices. One you can do a link say, for example, TIMSS
L4	was administered in 1995. By the time we get to 1999 it's
15	four years old. Now you can go back and say let's use the
16	link we had back in 1995, but there is a possibility that
L7	things have changed. And the relationship between NAEP and
18	let's say TIMSS might be different four years later. You
19	won't know until you look at it.
20	Now if you do look at it and find that it hasn't
21	changed, then you are on safeguards of using that old link.
22	But if you look at and find that it has changed then it is

1	bouncing all over the place. That's because things are
2	changing all over the world. Obviously statistics that are
3	down the relationship has changed.
4	As an example, it might be that if you look at
5	the TIMSS and this new test, people might start teaching a lot
6	of what's on this new test and not what's on TIMSS. At which
7	point the relationship between
8	CHAIRMAN SMITH: This is actually a very
9	difficult problem, that this is going to raise here.
10	MR. PHILLIPS: The relationship between TIMSS
11	and the national math test might be this in, let's say, 1999,
12	when we get to the year 2004 it might not be the same
13	relationship. So it will be misleading to use this old
14	equating it like this. So what that would mean is that, the
15	growth on the national math test is a lot more than you found
16	on here in 1999, the relationship has changed, slope has
17	changed and the intercept has changed.
18	So what you want to do is look at this each
19	year, if you find it still works then you use it. But if you
20	find that it is not working, then you want to use it more a
21	more current one because you want to get the best prediction
22	of TIMSS that you can get from this test that is administered

1	in the year 2004. And
2	MR. IVENS: Your standard error prediction, when
3	you figure it out, is going to be so large it won't make any
4	difference what your prediction is.
5	MR. PHILLIPS: Well, if that's the case then you
6	don't do this anymore. Because this empirical question. If
7	the standard area gets to be too big that you can't do this
8	anymore, stop doing it. Yes?
9	MR. DOBBS: I have what I hope is a more basic
10	question. This is Rick Dobbs and looking at the time lines,
11	the models you keep putting up there talk about the 2000 test.
12	I'm looking at the '99 test.
13	MR. PHILLIPS: We have a problem with 2000,
14	we'll look at '99. Let me tell you well, we don't have a
15	problem, we have an issue. I have to ask a question
16	MR. DOBBS: You have a question and the answer.
17	That's good.
18	MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. I think everything is
19	going to be fine with this design once we get started. The
20	trouble with getting started with the year 1999
21	MS CHANG: Right, and the problem is, and I
22	don't want you to think from this from Gary's slide, that

1	the RFP is written. It is not. We are still gathering the
2	information. I have we have no draft over at the contracts
3	office, and so we need your information. The draft has not
4	been written. We are still gathering.
5	MR. PHILLIPS: If you, let me get back to this
6	real quick. As you can see we are talking about the year 2000
7	we need to get started back here, item writing in 1998 because
8	the RFP will be awarded.
9	The trouble is the year 1999, we are getting
10	started three quarters of the way through the calendar year
11	and stuff that should have gotten done back here will not
12	cannot get done under the RFP.
13	Now you have two choices. One is everyone who
14	gets the award has to hit the ground running and work real
15	fast to try to make up, or we could do something outside of
16	the award and provide it to the contractor when the contract
17	is awarded.
18	Our current thinking is to do that. This is
19	very similar to what we did in the national assessment in
20	1990, while we were waiting for the National Assessment
21	Governing Board to be created following the legislation, the
22	1990 math assessment had to be conducted and we couldn't wait

1	for them to get on board, to get up to speed to develop the
2	framework. So we developed the framework through the contract
3	award actually got on board they adopted the framework.
4	They could have said no I don't like what you have done, I
5	want to tweak it or change it or do something different. But
6	they decided to adopt it.
7	The same thing can happen here. We can do some
8	of the work before the RFP is awarded. It's been given to the
9	contractor, they then evaluate the quality of it and take it
LO	from there.
11	So the things that need to be done is in '97
12	that we would like to do under the contract if we can, item
13	and test specifications have to be written so that the
14	framework in NAEP, you can take the framework in NAEP but we
15	want to set up item and test specifications. Now there, those
16	specifications are already there for NAEP, so they just have
L7	to be modified for this new test.
18	Items have to be written. These are tentative
19	time lines for that to take place. We are looking at a large
20	number of items in each subject would need to be written. And
21	then a pilot. What we would do is we would like to have the
2.2	pilot, in the future we will have April and May of each year.

1	for example, for the '99 assessment would be April/May of '98.
2	But we can't do that this time. So we will have a
3	January/February and that pilot would be conducted under the
4	contract.
5	So these two things would have to be done
6	outside of the contract. We will do those with an agency or a
7	group of some sort and then provide them to the contractor
8	once the contractor is on board.
9	MR. MINCHEW: And the RFP will spell this out
10	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.
11	MR. MINCHEW: so that in constructing prices
12	
13	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.
14	MS LENKE: So the January, February and October
15	are really in '98 dates. Is that correct?
16	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes they are.
17	MS LENKE: They are in the '97 column.
18	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes, January, February for item
19	pilot
20	MS LENKE: And then October.
21	CHAIRMAN SMITH: would be in '98.
22	MR PHILLIPS: I'm sorry you are right That's

1	a mistake. Yes, you are right.
2	CHAIRMAN SMITH: The Advisory that's the only
3	one October would be '97
4	MR. PHILLIPS: Good eye.
5	MR. OSWALD: So, there will be a contractor that
6	you will choose outside of this RFP process. Maybe an
7	existing contractor for one of your other programs that will
8	do this work prior to selection of this contractor?
9	MR. PHILLIPS: Right.
10	MR. OSWALD: Will that contractor be permitted
11	to bid on this contract?
12	MR. PHILLIPS: I'm not sure about that, it's a
13	contractual legal issue that we are dealing with
14	MR. OSWALD: Because it does in essence create a
15	tremendous advantage for that contractor.
16	MR. PHILLIPS: Well it might be, of course,
17	there might be someone that's not going to be a bidder on
18	larger
19	MR. OSWALD: My question is are you going to
20	make sure that's the case?
21	MR. PHILLIPS: We will make sure that that's
22	MR. OSWALD: That it's done fairly.

1	MR. PHILLIPS: We are not going to give this to
2	somebody that will give them a competitive advantage.
3	MR. OSWALD: Okay.
4	MR. PHILLIPS: So that we will get one off.
5	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Got any imaginative ideas about
6	other ways of tackling this issue? That is the item
7	preparation issue, time, field tests, and so on. We'd love to
8	hear them.
9	MR. DOBBS: It brings back one basic question,
10	that is this is Greg Dobbs you guys did a good
11	explanation of why grade four and why grade eight. Why '99?
12	MR. PHILLIPS: Let's have an election here.
13	(Laughter). That's a given.
14	MR. OSWALD: Gary, one of the things you said at
15	the beginning when you talked about the things that were given
16	because the President actually said them in his speech, and
17	things that go beyond that which are not on that page of prior
18	decisions.
19	The 80/20 split was one of those issues. But
20	you did not list as a given, and I don't remember the
21	President specifically committing to an 80/20 split. My
22	question is, how firm is that? Is that really a policy that

1	the Department has determined? Or is that because that's the
2	only way you feel the product can be NAEP-like enough that you
3	can get the equating because it has a big variable as to I
4	believe it has a big variable. I don't if others agree. It's
5	a big variable as to the acceptance this is going to have when
6	it gets out into the field in school districts because it does
7	have a major effect on cost.
8	If it is a possibility that this program won't
9	be funded, federally funded beyond a certain period, it
10	becomes an issue as to whether or not school districts are
11	going to want to pay the premium for open-ended items even
12	though they bring an advantage. And especially a long-
13	constructed response piece of that versus pure multiple
14	choice, for example.
15	Without getting into the theoretical debates
16	about well maybe there is no way to avoid those debates
17	about what makes the best assessment, I'm talking merely about
18	feasibility here now, on a program this large. So is that
19	something basically that just is
20	MR. PHILLIPS: It's pretty fixed, it's a
21	philosophy at this point. It's a combination of philosophy
22	and symbolic and you know, the tests should in some ways

1	reflect some of the I don't want to get into an argument
2	about multiple choice versus extended response items, but
3	somehow reflect a little bit more of the teaching that goes on
4	in classrooms. To the extent the response becomes symbolic in
5	that regard.
6	In any case, it's you know, the NAEP is about
7	60/40 is that
8	CHAIRMAN SMITH: About that.
9	MR. PHILLIPS: about 60/40. It just doesn't
10	quite get us to NAEP but it gets us close enough to NAEP we
11	think so we can pretty faithfully represent NAEP. It's a
12	mixture of different reasons. And it seems like a good
13	balance.
14	I agree, obviously, it would be a lot less
15	expensive if we didn't have the extended response. And we've
16	actually, something we haven't mentioned, I think we are going
17	to put in something in the RFP about an exploration toward
18	moving it to a computer based test. That would obviously make
19	it a lot easier. You wouldn't have the extended response on
20	it. But we are pretty well settled at that point, at the
21	80/20.
22	MR. MINCHEW: In following up on that, are you

1	anticipating that there would be both a paper and pencil and a
2	computer based testing at some point, before a full migration
3	of a computer based test?
4	MR. PHILLIPS: I suspect so. Yes, we really
5	haven't though this through very much, but that would be, I
6	think make it a lot more accessible to people, I think.
7	MR. MINCHEW: If you administer the test in a
8	two week period, what turnaround time are you looking at for
9	scoring and reporting?
10	MR. PHILLIPS: I think we're looking at weeks
11	and a part of and that again has to be part of you know,
12	how to do that has to be worked out in the contract. But,
13	this is not going to be like six months later. This is a
14	quick turnaround. If we give the test in April, we'd like to
15	get results out that year.
16	MR. ELFORD: Isn't that up to the licensee?
17	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, but part of the agreement is
18	going I don't know what's going to be in the agreement with
19	the licensee, but there will be something in there that deals
20	with, something you can't take years to get results out. So -
21	- I don't know what that would be yet, but we will be some
22	standardization there, as much as possible. But you are

1	right, it is ultimately up to the licensee.
2	MR. OSWALD: What are your time schedules now?
3	What would you give a testing schedule
4	MR. PHILLIPS: The test with constructive
5	response items on it would probably be a couple of months, in
6	short that's a great time that's a good turnaround.
7	Usually only big cities and state programs get through
8	negotiation, but, that's pushing it usually. For multiple
9	choice
10	MR. OSWALD: It's usually four and six weeks.
11	MS CHANG: If we gave it in April/May, would you
12	get the response back by the end of school in June?
13	MR. OSWALD: No. Well, a lot of school
14	districts don't close in June. A lot of schools close in May,
15	the third week of May.
16	MS CHANG: So the parents would not
17	MR. OSWALD: We live with this every spring.
18	The parents would
19	MR. DOBBS: I would like your opinion on that as
20	far as the perspective response part. It wouldn't necessarily
21	two months or more. I think more like we offer 28 days
22	time, constructive response. A mixed type of test like this.

1	So, it shouldn't be longer than multiple choice. If multiple
2	choice is three, maybe it's going to be six. If multiple
3	choice would be two, maybe it would be four. But I don't
4	think it would be a matter of months and months.
5	MR. JOHNSON: Of course, all the dates are a
6	function of how many. I mean we can start talking about if
7	you give one test you can probably get it back to you this
8	afternoon. But if you are talking millions so it's all a
9	function of how many.
10	MR. DOBBS: I was thinking of the mix of those
11	variables.
12	MR. JOHNSON: In between the two, right.
13	MR. PHILLIPS: This is an issue of course that
14	we are aware of, is how long it's going to take. The other
15	thing is it interacts with when we are doing the test
16	administration. Right now we are thinking April/May, but if
17	it turns out that we can't get it back fast enough we may have
18	to change that.
19	MR. DOBBS: When do you normally give now?
20	What's your the average time?
21	CHAIRMAN SMITH: April. Just one term?
22	MR. DOBBS: No, just April is when the test.

1	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, through the first two weeks
2	of May.
3	MS CHANG: And then you are telling us then the
4	reports are not available until the next school year?
5	MR. IVENS: No, this goes back to what John was
6	saying about is it multiple choice, constructive response or a
7	mixture of the two. On multiple choice and I think Rick
8	hit it right in terms of estimating it. You can turn around
9	multiple choice test, whatever the volume, you can do that in
10	two weeks. Constructive response would probably take four.
11	If it takes three weeks for multiple choice, it
12	would be six for constructive response.
13	MR. SMITH: The issue is can the machine score
14	it or does it have to be done by a human being. If you are
15	talking about eight million tests, that means you have to find
16	enough people to score those, let's say there is two items per
17	test, 16 million items. So
18	MR. IVENS: Two readers per item.
19	MR. SMITH: What?
20	MR. IVENS: Two readers per items.
21	MR. SMITH: You are going to set some standards
22	about how many readers you want. So, the number gets, the

1	number gets to be pretty hard. And recognize that what you
2	are also doing is putting you are laying this on top of
3	exactly on top of all the other testing that's being done.
4	MR. PHILLIPS: The multiple choice could be
5	scored by hand.
6	MR. SMITH: I'm talking about timing. Yes, of
7	course, anything can be scored by hand and but if you are
8	looking for turn around, designing around those issues becomes
9	compelling.
LO	MR. MINCHEW: But if you are scoring I'm
11	Daniel Minchew you are scoring on eight million, you would
12	want to do them by machine, rather than hand wouldn't you?
13	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, but except I don't think we
L4	are going to have as much standardization as you are assuming
15	across all these different test sites. Some school districts
L6	will do things by machine, some will not. So, and some
L7	districts, or some places will take a lot longer.
18	MR. SMITH: So you're anticipating a lot of the
19	scoring be done at the district level?
20	MR. PHILLIPS: No, no. I think a lot of it will
21	be contracted out, but it is conceivable that a district would
22	have a capacity to do it. Some districts would

1	MR. SMITH: It's conceivable.
2	MR. PHILLIPS: Many don't. But some would.
3	MR. IVENS: More would have the capability of
4	doing machine scoring than doing constructive response.
5	MR. PHILLIPS: Right.
6	MR. ELFORD: Would a licensee not be allowed
7	just to use
8	MR. PHILLIPS: I don't think so, we are going to
9	work that through. But we've got, I have to think about that
10	one. I don't have a quick answer. We don't want to have a
11	situation where you get to pick and choose which parts of the
12	test you can take. But maybe there might be a way I have
13	to think about that.
14	MR. IVENS: I do think you opened up my
15	you made the comment, I believe, or maybe Gary did, about the
16	difference between these tests as an indication or an index of
17	what the students are capable of doing, and not a
18	comprehensive assessment like NAEP.
19	I think in terms of design considerations, if
20	what you are starting out is a comprehensive assessment in
21	reading and math, you might argue more strongly for certain
22	item types, multiple choice mixes with constructive response

1	and so on. But if what we are trying to do is this serving as
2	a proxy for a much larger assessment and an indicator of where
3	individual students are relative to other students in that
4	year and linking it to NAEP and so on. The efficiencies of
5	multiple choice may outweigh what face validity you might
6	or political validity you might gain from having a token
7	constructive response items in there.
8	MR. PHILLIPS: The other thing we thought about
9	doing was to have, I mean one way of approaching that would be
10	to have a multiple choice test with side booklet that's
11	performance items optional, but not a part of the scaling and
12	all that. But we've got to spend more time working that
13	through.
14	MR. IVENS: That would put the onus back on the
15	local districts if that was consistent with their philosophy,
16	district or state testing programs, they could administer that
17	and score it. But
18	MR. PHILLIPS: Right, but in terms political
19	validity, having this national test be a multiple choice test
20	doesn't sound like
21	CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think that's right. I think
22	what Gary said I would be very surprised if we cannot put

2	MR. PHILLIPS: There is one question I could ask
3	you before Mike leaves at 11:30, and that is I mentioned
4	earlier about the idea that this test booklet, which would be
5	a single booklet, could be used by you or states or local
6	testing programs to augment what you are doing. And I didn't
7	get any reaction to that. I was hoping maybe you could give
8	me some while Mike is still here.
9	CHAIRMAN SMITH: It was a comment made, somebody
10	just made a comment that this would be on top of a lot of
11	other tests. And I think, you know, to some extent it will
12	be. On the other hand, from the perspective of the student,
13	we don't mind it being seen as part of a battery of the larger
14	assessment that is given in early April to every fourth grader
15	the way it's been given every April in Arlington for 20 years.
16	This would just be a part of that assessment.
17	It would take two periods, two classroom
18	periods. It would be perhaps not the only reading test, or
19	not the only math test. There might be a more elaborated one.
20	We want to make it as we need your advice about how to
21	make that as possible as we can. Go ahead.
22	MR DOBBS: From my standpoint the reason that

1

out this 80/20 split.

1	I didn't ask a lot of questions or jump right in at that point
2	is because there are so many questions about what is going to
3	be available and when. I'm still trying to piece together,
4	for example, if for '99 we were lucky enough to be a licensee
5	and be able to put this, embed it as you are talking about in
6	something else, when would we have those items to work with
7	and when would we have the information about the linking to
8	work with?
9	Normally we don't sit down in '97 and start
10	talking about tests for '99.
11	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Right.
12	MR. DOBBS: Theoretically. We start thinking
13	about it earlier than that, start doing something, so there
14	are a lot of questions. I imagine that folks who are in our
15	shoes have the same types of questions and issues here about -
16	- there are just so many questions about it, it's hard to
17	commit to it right now. So, no question about it.
18	MR. OSWALD: I think an issue to follow up on
19	Rick's comment is that a lot depends on the availability of
20	opportunities for publishers to link their other assessments
21	to this program.
22	For example welve been talking about linking

1	these assessments to NAEP and to TIMSS. But it would probably
2	not make a lot of sense if it was sitting in the middle of a
3	battery of publishers tests substituted perhaps for the
4	reading test at grade four of a publishers battery, and
5	substituted for the math test at grade eight of a publishers
6	battery, if it wasn't linked to the rest of the publisher's
7	tests.
8	One of the things that's going to happen is when
9	this test gets out there and everybody pays attention to it
10	and the President talks about it and it's discussed all over
11	the country and results are compared, there is going to be
12	tremendous pressure put on school districts to make sure that
13	everything else they do is aligned with what this test is
14	measuring. Because the stakes will be much higher than NAEP
15	is right now for them.
16	And as a and that's, of course, one of the
17	goals. As a result of that there is going to be a need in the
18	marketplace for a test at grades seven and grade six that's
19	going to eventually predict how the students are going to do
20	on the eighth grade math test. And a test at grade one and
21	two and three that's going to predict how the student is going
22	to do on the reading test at grade four. The likely providers

1	of those tests are the publishers who provide tests.
2	Therefore, it would be logical that those people will want to
3	somehow have data to link their systems with your system.
4	That raises an issue as to whether or not you
5	want to restrict the availability of things like item data and
6	statistics on the test only to the licensees because you
7	might, for example, find a company theoretically who is not
8	particularly interested because maybe the economics aren't
9	there, of actually being a licensee to administer this test,
10	but still wants to do some of the other things like tie in
11	their materials. For example, I think of text book publishers
12	who aren't here now, but who would probably want to have a lot
13	of data so they could align their instructional materials with
14	the program.
15	I guess you could say that since the NAEP
16	frameworks are out there and no one is stopping them from
17	doing that right now, but there is a difference between doing
18	that and doing a statistical link.
19	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Well the NAEP frameworks will
20	be out there, the tests themselves will be out there after
21	they are made available. But they still won't have the
22	statistics necessarily. I don't Gary you may have thought

1	about this, we haven't discussed it, whether or not I
2	haven't discussed it, whether or not the data about the
3	behavior of the test will be out there. The is the data
4	that are gathered by the contractor.
5	It's an interesting set of issues. Gary and I
6	actually discussed the possibility of the linking between
7	let's say publishers tests in reading and this reading test
8	discussed the possibility of equating having those equated
9	by private publishers or by state assessment. And then the
10	question arises, well, why do you need this new test if you've
11	already related it back to the other tests? If you've related
12	as part of the publisher, you could just say, look use our
13	test, it's already linked to the national test. You know,
14	it's cheaper this way. Instead we've linked it up through a
15	multiple choice test. Charge you two bucks for it or three
16	bucks for it, rather than five dollars. We haven't settled on
17	these issues.
18	There are issues of drift that get involved in
19	it, and so on, until you are creating a new form every year,
20	and equating it every year. It's got a little more we have
21	a little more control over the potential drift. You know, it
22	just gets very complicated and we haven't arrived at a firm

1	set of decisions about it.
2	But there are obviously these are obviously
3	important to you in your thinking about how to incorporate
4	them into your assembly or battery of assessments. That makes
5	it important to us because we would like you to be able to do
6	that in a thoughtful way. It's very clear that this is not
7	going to be a test that's anywhere as comprehensive as many of
8	the reading tests or math tests you put out. We are not going
9	to have the subscales scores and so on, that could be used as
10	diagnostic instruments.
11	So, you know, it's very much in our best
12	interest to make this as adaptable to your needs as possible.
13	So, these are all good questions.
14	The other issue, one of the things that the
15	first questions that folks that go out and talk about the
16	reading test get is where are the tests that are available at

The other issue, one of the things that the first questions that folks that go out and talk about the reading test get, is where are the tests that are available at first grade and second grade to diagnose kids that have got problems who may fail to succeed on the fourth grade test? So you are absolutely right, that's the real motivation back there is for a set of assessments or diagnostic tests that will give teachers information, parents information so they know what they need to do early on in order to get the kids

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	ready.
2	MS LENKE: Can I make a comment on trying to
3	follow up on what John was saying earlier. As you know, I'm
4	sure, many states have testing programs, tests they develop
5	themselves, often at grades four and eight, as well as other
6	grades. And those tests, of course, are targeted specifically
7	to the frameworks or the curriculum, whatever in that state.
8	And I guess my question would be in terms of how this test
9	might be used in that process, and I could see the states
10	you know, unless there is very clear direction in terms of how
11	the states would be using the assessment in grade four and
12	grade eight in connection with their own state assessment. I
13	think that needs to be very clearly articulated.
14	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Right.
15	MS LENKE: Because there are going to be some
16	incompatibilities. Perhaps in terms of difficulty. Probably
17	in terms of, you know, the content that is assessed and so
18	forth. So, I think if the intent obviously is to get the
19	states involved in this kind of activity, then they need to
20	understand how
21	CHAIRMAN SMITH: That's exactly right and part
22	of our hope is that because the NCTM has been around for a

1	long time and a lot of states tailor their content standards
2	and frameworks around the NCTM, not exactly but close. And
3	the NAEP is close to NCTM, that we are not too far off in
4	math. And in reading, we are checking an end point in effect,
5	rather than something in the middle.
6	So our hope, again, is that the NAEP reading
7	framework while the performance standards may be a little
8	more challenging than many states are, and know that they are,
9	we hope the dimension is roughly the same and close enough so
10	that it's not going to screw up folks who have been preparing
11	kids for a set of assessments that are aligned with standards.
12	If we throw in something that's 40 degrees from that or 60
13	degrees from that, that's not we are not doing them a
14	service because they put in hard work and not succeed very
15	well on this test.
16	So, I know Maryland signed up for this, as you
17	may know. Chris Cross and we have been talking with a variety
18	of other people and they thought it fit them pretty well. And
19	I think we will find in other states the same kind of
20	reaction. In part because it is math and reading. History
21	might not, science might not, and some of the others.
22	MS LENKE: And of course, not all states are

1	well
2	CHAIRMAN SMITH: And not all states, right
3	MR. MINCHEW: Daniel Minchew. In your opening
4	comment you made appropriate reference to the people who are
5	in the business now and not competing with people. But in the
6	long term, do you see this fourth grade and eighth grade
7	assessment being a replacement for or supplement to other
8	entrepreneurial offerings that systems or states would have?
9	CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think it's a supplement at
10	this point, in significant part because it is not as
11	comprehensive. But I would see as a replacement if we were go
12	to a more extensive assessment that had subscale scores and
13	more diagnostic strength to it. Our hope, obviously, is that
14	it doesn't interfere with the competitive nature of the
15	business. That in fact it helps to stimulate it
16	MR. PHILLIPS: And develop more business.
17	CHAIRMAN SMITH: And develop more business to
18	some extent, that's right. And hopefully better business.
19	Assessments that are more challenging for students. Obviously
20	we are of the mind that many assessments out there have not
21	been challenging enough and we need to have all kids exposed,
22	taught well the kinds of content and skills that allow them to

1	succeed much better than they have in the past.
2	The long run goal is reform and improvement for
3	all students. We think that this is going to have a positive
4	effect on that, though we obviously need all your help to make
5	that work. So we don't want to undercut anybody's business.
6	MR. MINCHEW: And I have one other question for
7	Gary. If you assume that, I would say there be eight million
8	tests. How would you think these would break down between
9	fourth grade reading level tests and ninth grade eighth
10	grade -
11	MR. PHILLIPS: About four million each.
12	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes, we will just that's the
13	entire cohort. That's every kid, every fourth grader, every
14	eighth grader is eight million. So
15	MR. PHILLIPS: That's the upper limit.
16	CHAIRMAN SMITH: We do have an upper limit,
L7	that's right.
18	MR. OSWALD: One of the I'm sorry
19	MR. PHILLIPS: Someone else may
20	MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'm Carlos Rodriguez. What's
21	your opinion of only granting states licenses? Only a state
22	would be a volunteer licensee. And therefore, sort of force

1	them into a position of, maybe force is the wrong word
2	compel, to align this assessment to what they are doing in
3	their own structures?
4	MS LENKE: I don't think states are going forced
5	to do that. You know, I think there is some negative feeling
6	about being forced to do anything by states, but like
7	MR. RODRIGUEZ: what if you make it voluntary
8	at the state level?
9	MS LENKE: Voluntary at the state level. The
10	thing is that, of course, all states don't have assessment
11	programs. On the other hand, there are large school districts
12	that do have state assessment programs, or city-wide programs,
13	you know that are, that the criteria referenced could be
14	developed for them from scratch and so forth. So I don't feel
15	necessarily though that it should be restricted to state level
16	only. I think, again, in situations where there is no state-
17	wide assessment program that, in particular, that should be
18	allowed to license
19	MR. JOHNSON: How would that if you don't
20	have a state-wide program now, how would that prevent you from
21	participating in the
22	MS LENKE: It wouldn't. I was more concerned

1	about those states that do have, that are high stakes
2	assessment.
3	MR. JOHNSON: Back on the earlier point, is
4	there any real need to link the work of a contractor with the
5	management of licensing? Couldn't that be a totally separate
6	contract?
7	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, we need to go back and think
8	it through.
9	CHAIRMAN SMITH: That is possible.
10	MR. PHILLIPS: Those are good comments and that
11	has always been a fuzzy area for
12	MR. ELFORD: Wouldn't that be a cost
13	reimbursement contract priced?
14	MR. PHILLIPS: I don't know the answer but
15	MR. ELFORD: It would probably be because you
16	don't know how many licenses
17	CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think that's a that's a
18	real possibility.
19	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.
20	MS KOLE: I have another point. This is Adina
21	Kole, are there any other imaginative ideas that all you have
22	without the licensing agreement that it works best for you?

T	Other than what we've already heard. Because we want to try
2	avoid the usual
3	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Right, right. One of the
4	things I'm going to have to run, I'm sorry, the Secretary
5	and I intersect only so often and this is one of those times.
6	So I need to see him.
7	I think what we need from you is that kind of
8	idea. I mean that's really concrete. It's something we could
9	move on and explore and so on. If you have any ideas like
10	that, you know, after you leave you are on a plane or
11	whatever, send them back to us by E-mail or by letter,
12	whatever. We'll have to those will have to go on with the
13	record, right? They will have to go with the record, so
14	however you are going to communicate with us now goes out to
15	the public. So I guess we can't have individual phone
16	conversations that could lead to
17	MS CHANG: No but for the Contracts Office, my
18	phone number is in your list of participants and we really
19	welcome those types of things. Because how we structure this
20	contract, we are struggling with now, and you've mentioned
21	some things here that we haven't thought about, at all and we
22	are looking for something that will encourage you to compete

1	and therefore we don't want to write anything in the RFP
2	that's not going to encourage you to compete.
3	So if you can think of some way to solve the
4	competition between you, please let us know.
5	MR. NAFZIGER: What is the latest point in time
6	that that information could be given and really be taken
7	seriously could be taken seriously?
8	MS CHANG: Up to the closing of the RFP. As I
9	said, we tend to have draft statement awards out
10	MR. PHILLIPS: It will be released in April, so
11	up to that point.
12	MS CHANG: Up to that point, and if you see
13	something wrong in the RFP, you know you can always ask
14	questions and the RFP can be amended. So please continue to
15	think. My thought is that when we put a draft on the Web that
16	we are also going to put some of these types of special
17	clauses that we intend to put in the RFP in mechanisms, and I
18	welcome your comments back on them.
19	CHAIRMAN SMITH: So it's pretty open for the
20	next two months.
21	MS CHANG: Yes.
22	CHAIRMAN SMITH: The other motivation here, of

1	course, is not just to have you compete, the greater
2	motivation is to have you be interested in being a licensee.
3	That's, I think is certainly as much motivation as the other.
4	And that means the RFP, the work of the contractor has to be
5	structured in such a way that it makes it possible for you to
6	even think about that in a realistic fashion.
7	MR. URWITZ: Can I just make one suggestion? I
8	note that, you know, that there is already good potential for
9	slippage here talks about a draft statement of work being made
10	available in late February which means by two more days.
11	MR. PHILLIPS: But it is
12	MR. URWITZ: Excuse me?
13	MR. PHILLIPS: We are not too far off on that.
14	MR. URWITZ: Okay, because I just thought if the
15	RFP is to be released in April or May and proposals are due in
L6	June, you probably would be better served not to collapse our
L7	side of it by saying that proposals need to be due in 30 days
18	instead of 60 days in order there is out because the same
19	way these things may be tricky for you, they are going to be
20	tricky. You don't want to get half-baked proposals.
21	MR. PHILLIPS: Exactly. That's why we are
22	working so hard now to get our work done so you have more time

2	MR. URWITZ: Exactly. If in fact you don't get
3	it to release until sometime deep in May, you may want to give
4	60 days and then speed up your evaluation of contractors.
5	CHAIRMAN SMITH: But it's also the reason we are
6	trying to get I'm sorry it's also the reason we are
7	trying to get these issues out now in a public way, so that
8	everybody can be thinking about it.
9	MS LENKE: Let me just throw out a suggestion
10	for you all to think about, too, and states, a few states have
11	done this which is structure your RFP in sections where a
12	contractor or a potential contractor may want to bid on
13	Sections 1 and 3 and not on 2, 4, and 5.
14	I think if you did decide to go that way you
15	need an overall management contractor, you know, Section 1
16	might be management of program but then have different
17	contractors perhaps serve the item development function,
18	printing and distribution function for pilot, smaller
19	functions and so forth. So that there would be multiple
20	opportunities for people to do what they do best in responding
21	to the RFP.
2.2	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Right, yes, the alternative to

1

for yours.

1	that is to have a prime and subcontracts which
2	MS LENKE: Yes, but, yes, but in terms of the
3	publishing industry, that's we don't typically subcontract
4	with one another.
5	MR. OSWALD: I think it's going to be a trade
6	off between how much work the Department can do, the OERI I
7	can do versus how much you want contracted. I mean, obviously
8	
9	CHAIRMAN SMITH: That's right.
10	MR. OSWALD: The safest way for all of us would
11	be for the persons who administer all of the licenses and
12	decide who is a licensee and monitor their performance is for
13	you guys to do that yourselves and not to contract with one of
14	our competitors to do it. Or even a person who might it
15	would be very difficult in this whole arena of business to
16	find any company that does not sometimes compete with another
17	one of the companies in this area because there is a
18	tremendous variety of the scope of each company in terms of
19	some just do test development, some do development and
20	processing, some just do processing and printing. It becomes
21	very tricky.
2.2	MS IENKE: And you also if you do dogide to go

1	the section route, you will get, I think, the best advice
2	available of all the help here if companies have the
3	opportunity to participate.
4	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Great. Any last words for me?
5	I want to thank you all for coming. That's terrific. I know
6	it takes a particular effort to break away this quickly, but
7	it's very valuable to us and I think you can all see how
8	valuable this is. You've raised a lot of questions that we've
9	not been able to answer. So thanks very much.
10	MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks Mike.
11	MR. JOHNSON: Gary, can I ask you one question?
12	MR. PHILLIPS: We still have an hour. We've got
13	up to an hour.
14	MR. JOHNSON: How do you envision a person
15	desiring a school district or a state or what have you
16	desiring to participate noted by someone that they wished, how
17	does that process well, how do you expect that to work?
18	There is lots of school districts. I'm sitting out in the
19	Idaho
20	MR. PHILLIPS: Are you saying how do we market
21	this or
22	MR. JOHNSON: No well, yes, how am I to tell

1	you I want to participate? What do you envision as that kind
2	of thing?
3	MR. PHILLIPS: Well, again, I don't know the
4	answer. That's going to depend on how we do the licensing and
5	things like that. So that all has to be worked out by the
6	contractor. But I don't think we are going to have any
7	trouble with people knowing about this test.
8	MR. JOHNSON: Gary, you do envision the
9	contractor as being the recipient of that request. Is that
LO	right?
11	MR. PHILLIPS: Not necessarily. Again, the
12	conversation today is can you unduplicate the licensing from
13	the development? And up to this moment we've been thinking
L4	that we want to have those two be the same. But maybe there
15	is a way around that.
16	We have to weigh, in terms of our doing it of
L7	course it's probably better for you. But for us it's not so
18	good. So, we have to think that through. And another
19	possibility, of course, would be to have another contractor do
20	the licensing. And that might be someone who is not in the
21	business of test development, things like that. Something
22	like that. So there are other things we've got to be able to

1	work through to see what we come up with.
2	MR. IVENS: Gary, what do you see the
3	functionality of the license itself? I mean it would include
4	in there by executing the license with whomever I executed
5	with on the local district or the state, I'm going to
6	guarantee that I'll administer the test during some certain
7	window or score it by such and such a date, or I'll certify
8	that I'll follow your rules in use and don't use that it's
9	a way are the licenses around those issues?
10	MR. PHILLIPS: It's a way to minimize the misuse
11	of the test and to have some control, and to have the public
12	have confidence that when they see the results that they can
13	believe it because it will have the backing of the government.
14	Without that
15	MR. IVENS: Okay, but the monitoring aspect of
16	the administration to make sure it was administered correctly
17	and so on is going to be a big part of that.
18	MR. PHILLIPS: That's my assumption, but again,
19	I've always thought in the back of my head that there needs to
20	be some kind of monitoring. It can't be like in NAEP, that's
21	25 percent of the schools, in some states 50, in others we
22	can't do that with four million students per grade. But

1	MR. IVENS: Some states can't do it with only
2	700 districts.
3	MR. PHILLIPS: But there needs to be some way,
4	some monitoring mechanism so again that the public is assured
5	and we are assured that it's a level playing field. Otherwise
6	we are going to have, you know, 16,000 school districts doing
7	things 16,000 different ways.
8	MR. IVENS: So you want secure test centers
9	without the cost of secure test centers?
10	MR. PHILLIPS: Well, something like that.
11	MR. JOHNSON: Security of results is also an
12	issue person participating if you are a school district
13	to score and of course get the results. How confident can you
14	be with that?
15	MR. PHILLIPS: Well that might end up being one
16	thing that you can't do. I don't know. That's, again, the
17	whole licensing thing is something we've got to spend a lot of
18	time and I think we will bring in lots of advisor groups to
19	work on that. And that's, in many ways that's the most
20	critical aspect, it's not the technical stuff, it's the
21	licensing issue and the financial competitive aspects of it
22	that's a real problem. Which is why at all meetings we make

1	sure we have regar counser and contracts and grants and others
2	there to keep us straight.
3	MR. CALVIN: [Off mike.] Gary, much of the
4	information content, be of value to say a parent is going rely
5	on the norming activity. It seems to me a little difficult to
6	think about ways in which the tests might be embedded in
7	broader values. Because that would reconfigure the test
8	administration process that some jurisdictions might use and
9	how stable a scale score might be, having been linked to say
10	NAEP or TIMSS. If the test conditions given during the actual
11	administration in 1999 say, didn't match very well with test
12	administration conditions in the norming period of '98, that
13	might be more likely to be true if it were an embedded item
14	than a larger battery?
15	MR. PHILLIPS: That's one of the challenges is
16	that, I'm more aware that this has to be solved. The
17	motivational characteristics and testing conditions of the
18	field test has to be the same as the actual administration.
19	Otherwise you can't trust the numbers. Now it might be that
20	this idea of going intact forms might not survive. It might
21	be that a contractor will come up with a better idea. One
22	that better ensures that the development is administered under

1	comparable conditions.
2	One way of doing that might be to have forms
3	embedded while you are administering the test, have it, have
4	forms embedded there or like the SAT. You have part of the
5	SAT that's going to be used in future years, and the user
6	doesn't know which part that is. So there are all sorts of
7	different ways of doing it.
8	This is one way, but it may not be the way that
9	we ultimately do it. But I'm well aware of the fact that
10	whatever motivation when you select this form back in 1998
11	and it's going to be administered in '99, the data we collect
12	on this form in '98 needs to be as close as possible to the
13	administrative conditions, this is going to be a real
14	assessment of '99.
15	Again, I think we might have a little trouble
16	the first year. So in 1998 we might have some difficulty. I
17	think after that, once we get into a cycle, then we'll have
18	less difficulty with replicating the actual administrative
19	conditions in the field test.
20	I keep hearing in several different ways that
21	you have a little problem with this field test design intact.
22	Forms and things like that. We'll have to think that

1	through.
2	MR. OSWALD: Gary, another area of concern, more
3	actually for you in the Department and President than it is
4	for the particular licensees, is has to do with the public
5	acceptance of this and what kind of mechanisms you have in
6	place to make sure that you don't run into some really serious
7	problems with criticism of the test.
8	One of the things that is a very big step for
9	the Department in making individual student scores available
10	and school district averages, is you are now moving into the
11	realm that a lot of us have been in for years where test
12	scores have high stakes. They are used to sell real estate,
13	they are used to hire and fire principals and so on.
14	And another whole arena of that has to do with
15	people, groups of people who have opinions about what is fair
16	to ask kids and what is not fair to ask kids. I've yet to see
17	that we can assemble any sensible group of people that will
18	come up with an idea of what is fair that doesn't offend some
19	group, some place in the country.
20	And I notice in your development plan and in the
21	release of the technical information that you guys have had
22	out on the Web for a while now, you talk about guidance by a

1	couple of advisory groups. One of them is math and reading
2	teachers, parents, local and state educators, civic and
3	business leaders, as well as representatives of the testing
4	industry, and someone from NAGB. But you don't have a
5	specific sort of sensitivity bias review panel listed whose
6	only function is to look at the test in advance of its
7	administration and determine whether or not it has a content
8	that will be deemed offensive.
9	Now, is it I'm sure you've thought about
10	this, and is it sort of the expectation that you are just
11	going to get it out there and then it's going to take some
12	lumps like anything else anybody does and you will respond to
13	that after the fact? Or are you planning on I mean you can
14	have out cries from the conservative right and the liberal
15	left and all kinds of groups, as many states have found.
16	MR. PHILLIPS: No, we are not just going to put
17	it out there and tell people to take their best shot. We are
18	not going to do that. What we are we are going to make
19	this as good as possible given the constraint that we are
20	getting in the field in 1999, as we can make it.
21	And there will be at least two advisory groups
22	to each of the contractors. There will be a content advisory

1	group, but it won't just be reading people. It will be others
2	as well. And that's what you just described. There also
3	needs to be a technical advisory group for each contractor.
4	In addition to that there will be other
5	committees that will have to be formed that are not mentioned
6	in the public documents. For example, an item writing
7	committee, a sensitivity bias committee, where you look at
8	analysis and you look at the items for bias content and things
9	like that.
10	So there will be a whole host of those that will
11	be the responsibility of the contractor as part of the normal
12	routine development of the assessment to convene. And, of
13	course, we will be making sure that those committees are
14	representative and that the Christian right and all sorts of
15	groups are part of that process. The idea is to bring them in
16	and to let it happen there. So, all of that stuff I think
17	will take place. And it is in the plans to have it done prior
18	to 1999 in the first administration.
19	As time goes by, of course, we will get better
20	and better at it. But we want to get out there in 1999 with
21	the absolute best product that we can get.

MR. MINCHEW: Go ahead.

22

1	MR. NAFZIGER: Gary, are you saying, and I hope
2	you are, that how that is done will be left up to the
3	contractor?
4	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes. What we have provided, I
5	think are broad guidelines. But there a lot is going to
6	depend on this award, and of course, we will be involved in
7	that working with the contractor. But a lot of these details,
8	these questions, I don't think we feel, even though, for
9	example I might have some answers, I really don't think it's a
10	good idea to say what I think because it really needs to get
11	worked out by a contractor and in a national debate with a
12	consensus process, things like that. So
13	MR. MINCHEW: I think Dean and I had exactly the
14	same question. For the first year with some of the items
15	being produced maybe before, the contractor would not be
16	responsible for.
L7	MR. PHILLIPS: No, but the contractor would take
18	the items that were produced and through whatever mechanism
19	they have, through their advisory groups or whatever, they
20	would review these items and they could say these are no good,
21	this is not what we want. Or they might take them and do with
2.2	them what needs to be done. So it's kind of a double check

1	And of course, whatever we do to develop the
2	items, that will also have a national focus to it as well and
3	groups will be brought in, you know. So we will cover as many
4	bases as possible.
5	MR. JOHNSON: Gary, under test administration,
6	school districts and states set their calendars sometimes a
7	year or two in advance. So it seems to me it behooves us to
8	zero in on a date, on a window of administration so that you
9	don't find that there is a lot of people out there wanting to
10	do it, but they already filled up their calendars.
11	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, we need to do that. It's a
12	complicated thing because it interacts with things like how
13	quick you can get the results turned around, and it interacts
14	with curriculum issues and what the use of the test is. You
15	know, if you are going to use it for diagnostic purposes, it
16	doesn't make sense to give it at the end of the year when by
17	the time results are out the student is in another grade. So
18	
19	MR. JOHNSON: And another point on that issue is
20	that since you apparently are going to have just one form of
21	the test out there as opposed to parallel forms of the test
22	out there for administration by people choosing to

1	participate, it seems to me that that testing window, for
2	security reasons, needs to be as narrow as is humanly
3	possible.
4	MR. PHILLIPS: Exactly. Exactly.
5	MR. JOHNSON: The date line is pretty close to -
6	-
7	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, we haven't worked it out. I
8	mean I have no trouble with the day but on the other hand,
9	we've got to be realistic. So, what we say April-May, that's
10	not the window. It's somewhere within those two months. For
11	planning purposes, we had to have something, that that's what
12	we are shooting for.
13	Other questions? I can't begin to tell you how
14	important and valuable this has been, for all of us, legally,
15	contractually, politically, technically, I mean it's great.
16	MR. MINCHEW: One of the questions that I've
17	heard danced around, and I will put it rather directly, you've
18	ruled out having the contractor be the administrator of the
19	test. In other words, have the test developer do the whole
20	thing?
21	MR. PHILLIPS: That's right. That would be a
22	much more expensive activity and I think it would politically

1	put an enormous amount of resources into one contractor. And
2	I think I don't know how this will develop, maybe let's say
3	five or six years down the road, but initially I think the
4	desire is to go out the first time with as much flexibility as
5	possible and with as much competition as possible and at the
6	same time maintain standardization and maintain integrity
7	assessment so it's on balance. But I don't think we are going
8	to switch over to having everything done by one contractor.
9	Part of the appeal of this is that, that's the
10	opposite of what we are trying to do. The appeal of this is
11	that we are making a product, the government is making a
12	product. It's standing behind it. It's doing the work that
13	has to be done, guaranteeing the work that has to be done in
14	order to make it a good product so the public can trust it.
15	While on the other hand there is as much flexibility built in
16	and local control and local use of this. And if you have a
17	central contractor doing everything, it looks like, sort of
18	like NAEP all over again, except it's at an individual level.
19	MR. MINCHEW: Does that mean that you carry the
20	same philosophy to the NAEP RFP?
21	MR. PHILLIPS: No, the NAEP RFP will continue as
22	it is NAED is a federal survey assessment and it will be

1	conducted as in the past. It's being redesigned for the
2	National Assessment Governing Board and that will continue as
3	it is. This is not NAEP. It's not TIMSS, it's not NAEP.
4	It's a different entity. And, so that will continue, they
5	will continue to do the things that they have been doing, and
6	been doing a good job for 25 years.
7	MR. OSWALD: Do you expect the legal defense of
8	the instrument to be the responsibility of the Department, of
9	the development contractor or the licensee? For example,
10	let's say somebody sues whoever they think of suing because
11	they have been deprived in some way or hurt by the existence
12	of the test, or something about the test. This is not
13	uncommon in the world of testing.
14	Will that be something that will be built in to
15	one of the responsibilities that the test development
16	contractor will bid on or will that responsibility be totally
17	assumed by OERI and by the government?
18	MR. PHILLIPS: That's likely to be a big factor
19	of the test contract. But the specific details of that I
20	don't know. Our lawyers have got to work that through.
21	That's a consideration. I mean, of course, you can assume
2.2	there will be lawsuits. This is a testing program, not a

1	survey, and that's a whole different world and it brings in a
2	whole different set of people and concerns and issues. So, I
3	don't know the details but I do know there will be some legal
4	liability on the part of the contractor, the test developer
5	and the licensees. I don't know about, I'm assuming there
6	will be some here but I don't know the details. Adina Kole is
7	the lawyer who will be working on that.
8	MR. OSWALD: Just, if I could make a comment and
9	maybe some, you know, offer some advice. Although it's often
10	determined by the people who are creating a test and
11	administering a test who is responsible for what, that doesn't
12	stop the person who feels that he or she has been wronged from
13	suing somebody who is not responsible by some contractual
14	arrangement. And that unresponsible party still ends up
15	having to pay money to defend their lawsuit.
16	So theoretically it could be possible, let's say
17	if the reason that the person is suing has to do with an
18	improper administration issue, you would probably argue that
19	it's the licensee who administered the test or who provided
20	the materials, or maybe the school district itself is
21	responsible. However, the lawsuit could still name the test
22	developer as a responsible party. And it's up to that company

1	who has legal responsibility to defend themselves, to pay for
2	lawyers and to bring people forward to do that. So it's a
3	very, very intricate complicated issue that I think bears some
4	consideration, and some cost consideration too, for everybody.
5	MR. PHILLIPS: Right, a good point.
6	MR. ELFORD: This is regarding the same point.
7	Is there going to be any encouragement or inference in the
8	description of this test. Let's say at the eighth grade level
9	that it would be connected with promotion? For the next
10	spring?
11	MR. PHILLIPS: There will be a statement about
12	its appropriate uses. And the extent to which we will monitor
13	or regulate that is, regulate is not the right word but
14	monitor that, is an issue that still has to get resolved.
15	But yes, there will be something that specifies
16	what we consider to be the appropriate uses. And there might
17	even be some uses that we will say are forbidden. You cannot
18	use it for this purpose. I don't know what those are yet, but
19	that will be a
20	MR. ELFORD: Will you have one that you
21	encourage this use as part of a promotion requirement?
22	MR. PHILLIPS: I don't know what the uses would

2	MR. ELFORD: Is that possible?
3	MR. PHILLIPS: I don't know whether it's
4	possible. I don't know.
5	MR. ELFORD: You are setting standards and all
6	that
7	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, but for promotion has a
8	different, that means the test has to be developed for the
9	purpose and validated for that purpose. So once we know what
10	the uses and purposes are, then that's where we hone in on the
11	validation process, as part of the development. And the uses
12	and purposes have not been worked out yet. But there is a
13	commitment that there will be when the comments hit the
14	street.
15	MR. ELFORD: That will be worked out at what
16	stage of the game?
17	MR. PHILLIPS: It will be worked out probably as
18	part of the contractual work. That will be a specification in
19	the RFP that part of the consensus process and other
20	activities will, in the end, yield a set of statements that
21	indicate the recommended uses and purposes for this test.
2.2	MR ELFORD: So the contractor will be

1

be.

1	responsible for developing use guidelines?
2	MR. PHILLIPS: Something like that, yes. And
3	that's as you know that's part of the requirement of the
4	ATA joint technical standards that were specified as part of
5	the uses and purposes of this test. And then to make sure
6	that you have as much as possible validity data that indicates
7	that the test has been developed for and is useful for that
8	purpose.
9	MR. CONATY: John, you raised a number of issues
10	that have legal implications, the market implications. What
11	other kind of big issues are floating out there, John? You
12	raised the public acceptability issue, you raised the issue of
13	competition within the market versus collaboration and so on.
14	What other big kinds of issues might we pay particular
15	attention to as we are thinking about this?
16	MR. OSWALD: I raised the ones I thought of, and
17	I'm sure others can think of others. The whole thing is a
18	very big issue.
19	MR. CONATY: Well, I understand.
20	MR. MINCHEW: I would like to give a punctuation
21	to one issue that John raised. That is the rush to get it out
22	in '99 as opposed to a more orderly procedure, you might have

1	a better product, one that can be accepted, sold better if the
2	normal development schedule went into it. I think I see the
3	reasons that you are going to '99 as opposed to 2000, but that
4	is a factor that I'll just give a punctuation to John's
5	initially raising that.
6	MR. PHILLIPS: At this point that's a given, so
7	
8	MR. MINCHEW: I understand. But Joe asked what
9	are some of the big picture issues and I think that is a big
10	picture issue that really is not going to be changed, but one
11	that has been surfaced.
12	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes?
13	MR. SNOWHITE: Larry Snowhite. If you are going
14	to be starting RFP for the '99 administration, development and
15	administration, will there be, will that be a multi-year,
16	multi-year administration contract? Will it cover '99 and
L7	other years? Or are you going to be developing an RFP for the
18	2000 administration?
19	MR. PHILLIPS: I'm not sure I have a definitive
20	answer. I think the plan is to have a multi-year contract.
21	The maximum is five years. So it has to be somewhere between
22	one and five years.

1	MR. NAFZIGER: Gary, I think we can anticipate
2	that the stakes associated with this test are going to be
3	quite high. I think security becomes a big issue that
4	which I guess brings back the issue of the licensing
5	procedures, and sort of the complexity in all of that. I
6	think complexity opens some security doors that could be
7	problematic.
8	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, that's right. I'm very
9	concerned about the security issue. Because there would be a
10	lot of interest in getting a copy of this test early. So, and
11	then what do you do if someone gets a copy of the test and it
12	ends up in the front page of the <u>Washington Post</u> a month in
13	advance? So these are anticipational problems like that.
14	Again, we have to anticipate problems like that. Which is why
15	we need to have multiple forms available and I think there are
16	some ways that we can deal with that. But security is
17	paramount.
18	MS LENKE: A lot of that has to do too with who
19	will be responsible for planning the test proposals, whether
20	it's the licensee or the contractor.
21	MR. PHILLIPS: Exactly, exactly. We have to
22	decide how we want that in my thinking it would be the

1	ficensee. But I have to, I'm not sure that Steve, you are
2	taking good notes, right? I'm not sure that we so, that
3	has to be worked out.
4	There are lots of issues surrounding the test
5	security. There is also the standardization procedure. You
6	don't want to have a situation where in one district they get
7	20 extra minutes. You know and the scoring has to be done in
8	such a way that you don't want to have a situation where in
9	one district they are following the rules and they have to
10	reach, let's say, a certain level of reliability or greater
11	for scoring, but another district that's ignored. So, there
12	has to be a way in here of standardizing that and guaranteeing
13	to ourselves and the pubic that we are all it's a level
14	playing field.
15	MR. IVENS: That's one of the disadvantages of
16	doing all the pilot testing with intact forms.
17	MR. PHILLIPS: Right, right. The end use of
18	intact forms, we will have to seriously consider this, its
19	mission.
20	MR. JOHNSON: Gary, there is also, in terms of
21	producing the material, there is a huge range of peoples'
22	capability to produce test documents. So if you start letting

1	school districts and states and others do that, you will get a
2	you will go from one city to another and you won't
3	recognize the document because it will be so different in its
4	production.
5	MR. PHILLIPS: There is a trade off between the
6	desire to keep things as standardized as possible and the
7	desire to make it useful and participatory as possible.
8	MR. JOHNSON: I was going beyond
9	standardization. I was going to quality.
10	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.
11	MR. JOHNSON: Yes, everything.
12	MS LENKE: The other things, too, in terms of
13	licensing, you might license, let's say a district to
L4	administer the test. However, whether the contractor provides
15	copies or whether the district produces themselves, to have a
16	separate license for scoring? I'm thinking again
17	particularly, again, with the open ended
18	MR. PHILLIPS: Are you talking about multiple
19	licensing?
20	MS LENKE: Well, perhaps. I mean that's
21	something you need to consider. A district may be licensed to
2.2	administer the test, but not be licensed to do the scoring, if

1	in fact they don't have the proper training procedures in
2	place, or don't want to be scored. You know, some other
3	entity might want to do scoring.
4	MR. PHILLIPS: Let me ask you a question.
5	Several of you have had concerns or questions about the intact
6	field testing. What would you suggest as the alternative?
7	Given that we are testing items two years in advance. And
8	field test forms one year in advance. What would your, what
9	would be any ideas on how you would do that that would solve
10	some of the problems?
11	MS LENKE: The first year is the problem?
12	MR. PHILLIPS: Right.
13	MS LENKE: I mean once you pilot test and then
14	field test and then line, that's not the problem. It's the
15	first year.
16	MR. PHILLIPS: The first year, yes. So you
17	would be comfortable with this after the first year?
18	MS LENKE: Well (laughter) again how the
19	field test items field tested. Whether they are embedded in
20	the test, or is this, you know, a separate testing so forth.
21	Because the motivational aspect is an issue.
22	MR. IVENS: There are other options, Gary, but

1	it depends on the specifications of the test. Some things you
2	can do with some tests, some formats, but you can't do it with
3	others. Or not conveniently well. You may be in the boat
4	you are in may be the only boat on the ocean. It's sinking,
5	but it's still the only boat. You may not like the options on
6	the field testing and the piloting, but there may not be any
7	better options, given the constraints of the test design and
8	format and the constructive response is part of that
9	constraint process.
10	MR. PHILLIPS: Right, given pure constraints, I
11	think a different design would be there. But given the
12	constraints okay.
13	MR. MINCHEW: Gary, Daniel Minchew. Following
14	up on Joanne's comments. Did you rule out the possibility of
15	a standard form and a separate contract for independent
16	scoring? Something on the line of say the
17	MR. PHILLIPS: Are you suggesting that the
18	scoring be done by one contractor?
19	MR. MINCHEW: No, no, maybe three or four
20	contractors. But separating the scoring from the
21	administration of the test.
22	MR. PHILLIPS: The way I envisioned this would

1	work is, let's say a school district gets a license to
2	administer the test. They have to demonstrate to somebody,
3	either the government or somebody, that they can do this and
4	follow all the procedures.
5	Now one note, some districts might want to
6	contract with companies like yourself, some districts may want
7	to do it internally, if they can demonstrate that they have
8	the capacity. And other, and it might be that a given
9	district might want to contract the administration to one
10	group, one company, scoring to another, and the reporting to a
11	third. So there are all different sorts of possibilities.
12	The only constraint is they have to show as part of getting
13	the license, that they can do that. And then later there will
14	be some evidence that they in fact did it. And that's sort of
15	the way I saw it working.
16	Which gives, hopefully, sufficient
17	standardization across some different sites, and at the same
18	time gives the districts flexibility.
19	MR. MINCHEW: But do you open up a lot of room
20	for variations that in other parts of today you said you want
21	to avoid?
2.2	MR PHILLIPS: That's the trade off I don't

1	want to have a lot of variation. But I don't mind, I wouldn't
2	mind the variations as long as they lead to the same quality.
3	And that's the trick here is how restrictive do we for
4	example, NAEP they are administrated by contractor. NAEP
5	exams are administered by contractor. So there we, everything
6	is standardized and if there is a problem, it's true
7	everywhere, it's not true in some places and not in others.
8	So, I don't think we want that. And the
9	alternative is everybody does whatever the other extreme is
10	do whatever you want. Just give it to you and say, have a
11	nice day. So, somewhere in the middle there there has to be
12	something where we, where the government and the public can be
13	satisfied that the tests being administered, scored, analyzed
L4	and reported in a standard way, scores have the same meaning.
15	But at the same time there is some flexibility,
16	contractually, to do that. So that's what we are trying to
L7	find is that middle ground. I don't have a good answer.
18	MR. IVENS: Given your concerns, and I think
19	rightfully so, on the integrity of the data, putting the
20	government imprimatur on this to the public, you might revisit
21	again this idea of keeping the multiple choice and the
2.2	constructive response sections of the test congrete and secred

1	separately. Certainly for reading, and my guess is it's
2	probably also true on math, that the scoring of the
3	constructive response could get the data integrity that you
4	would like to have.
5	I don't think you want to so restrict who can do
6	the scoring of the constructive response or so control that
7	that you will get the integrity you want. I mean, states
8	won't agree, forget letting them do it at the local district
9	level, if we just do it at the state level, states won't agree
10	on the scoring of the constructive response.
11	MR. PHILLIPS: Well, what the states would do,
12	let's say you have two different states that want to
13	administer this test. One state might decide to score it
14	internally by their staff with the proper training. The other
15	state might want to contract it out with a company like
16	yourself. What we would be concerned about is that in both
17	cases the requirements that we have are followed. So I don't
18	know what those would be. I don't know what those are yet.
19	But there would be a set of requirements, things that have to
20	get done. That if done, it wouldn't matter to us whether it
21	was done locally
22	MR. IVENS: But unless you engaged in that

1	training process and you seeded certain papers so they were
2	common to both sets of raters in the two states plus my own
3	internal shop so that you could go back and check on it and
4	say, yes, it is true, Joanne's people scored it the same way
5	Dean's, Dean's did the same way as mine and mine did the same
6	way as these three states. But if you don't have it built in
7	so you can check that after the fact, it's simply an
8	assumption.
9	MR. PHILLIPS: Well, that's part of monitoring -
10	-
11	MR. IVENS: And it's probably not a warranted
12	assumption that people will be consistent with the scoring of
13	those.
L4	MR. PHILLIPS: Right.
15	MR. IVENS: So, but it's not that that's not
16	doable, is the result worth the effort of making it doable
L7	versus of a trade-off of flexibility? Again, you could say
18	that here is some set of exercises, one or more, that locally
19	can be scored following this general rubric, but we are not
20	going to put our stamp on it that these will be comparable
21	across all places that administer it. But we will put our
22	stamp on this multiple choice portion is comparable. Whether

1	it was scored locally, scored by the state, scored by the
2	commercial vendor, or hand scored, whatever.
3	And it could be that element that's linked to
4	the NAEP scales and the TIMSS and that element that could be
5	the norm side. And this other one is there to serve a social
6	political function related to what we want kids to be doing in
7	schools, teachers be emphasizing and face validity in their
8	life.
9	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, I understand exactly what
10	you are saying. But there is this political problem of going
11	out with a national test that's just multiple choice.
12	MR. IVENS: Well, no, the national test would
13	have that constructive portion in it, but that part would not
14	be necessarily scored or scored at the same standards or you
15	wouldn't have to put in the monitoring function to make sure
16	everybody was scoring it to the same standards.
17	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, but when we link it to NAEP,
18	let's say, we are going to be linking the multiple choice
19	MR. IVENS: No, just link the multiple choice
20	version.
20	version. MR. PHILLIPS: That's the problem. We linking

1	be claiming that this is just as good. People say well, why
2	take NAEP, you can just take the multiple choice items. You
3	know, NAEP has got all these open ended items and things like
4	that, measuring things that you are not measuring. And so, if
5	you think it's a credibility problem
6	MR. IVENS: Yes, but I had missed something
7	right there. Because I think you raised a different problem
8	that I hadn't thought about, I hadn't heard. If you make this
9	scoring and integrity and all multiple choice and constructive
10	response such that we put our stamp on it, doesn't that invite
11	the question why are we spending so much more for NAEP?
12	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes it would. But again NAEP is
13	doing things that this test is not doing. NAEP, for example,
14	is providing data on states and districts, and it's getting
15	background information on teacher practices, school resources,
16	things like that. This test, this is just a test. There is
17	no background information here, there is no a local for
18	example
19	MR. IVENS: Well you see, if you left the
20	constructive response as yes, you have to take it, you score
21	it locally, but we are not doing the linking on the basis of
22	that because of the problems of data integrity and

1	standardization, then it adds to your answer as to why do we
2	do this and we still have NAEP.
3	MR. PHILLIPS: I didn't quite get all that.
4	MR. IVENS: Well, in the sense that, as soon as
5	you have the constructive response and score it and have all
6	of the integrity issues resolved regarding the data, that more
7	invites the question
8	MR. PHILLIPS: I didn't mean to get us off on
9	NAEP. I understand your point now. Certainly from a
10	technical point of view, this new test will be a multiple
11	choice test and we can predict the NAEP score from it. That's
12	not a problem.
13	MR. IVENS: Yes.
14	MR. PHILLIPS: And we can say it's a predicted
15	score. Of course, it's not NAEP, if you want NAEP you have to
16	take NAEP. So that does increase the importance of NAEP and
17	at the same time gives us something that's more efficient and
18	put, to achieve and standardize. But the political problem
19	is, as a stand alone test, if the scores that we give are just
20	on multiple choice, then we are going to be criticized as any
21	other testing program would be that you are making big
22	decisions well let's say, for example, promotion because a

1	use.
2	I don't, I'm not saying it would, but it might
3	be something else. And there is going to be some real use of
4	this test. We are basing that on multiple choice items. And
5	the curriculum people are going to say, well wait a minute you
6	are completely out of sync with thinking, you know, everybody
7	else in the country, including test publishers. So, it's a
8	political policy
9	MR. IVENS: Well, but that pendulum is swinging
10	
11	MR. SMITH: Gary, I really think you are raising
12	another Steve is raising an appropriate issue. I would
13	suggest that the most important element to the issue is
14	consideration, exactly how you are going to license whomever
15	you are going to license for scoring constructive response
16	items versus selective responsive items. The issues are
17	profound. If you want to represent that the scoring was
18	consistent. They are profound issues.
19	MR. JOHNSON: I also think that you will have to
20	examine the premises that there is a lot of states out there,
21	a lot of large districts out there that want to score their
22	own test in this type of format. If you think about the

1	logistics of a state internally, without contracting, scoring
2	a 80/20 kind of test, you are talking about massive human
3	hours that are not likely to occur. So I guess I believe that
4	premise ought to be examined because you are allowing for it
5	when it is not ever going to happen. You made the process
6	more flexible than it needed to be, quite frankly.
7	I don't know if you've had a chance to talk to
8	the states about that, but I know some states now who give
9	districts the option to do it and they say no thank you.
10	MR. PHILLIPS: We are having a meeting like this
11	on Friday with the states.
12	MR. JOHNSON: I would test that premise.
13	MR. SMITH: Gary, anecdotally, it often starts
14	with great enthusiasm on the part of the state and the
15	district to do it locally, and once they started they scramble
16	away from it as fast as they can.
17	MR. PHILLIPS: I understand. Yes?
18	MR. DOBBS: I'd like to ask a question about
19	process and next steps. Earlier in the conversation today, I
20	believe it was when Helen was talking, I started to be a
21	little bit uncertain about what was going to happen and when,
22	and there were several meetings that were going to take place,

1	and there were some dates mentioned. And we were invited to
2	call, we were invited to write, I believe, a letter. We were
3	invited to you to your, communicated on the Internet with you.
4	All that should take place in what time frame, I guess I'm
5	asking. And what would be done with those, let's say we have
6	questions or suggestions. Are those all being collected?
7	Somebody mentioned they would become public record. Are the
8	responses also going to be public record and with that be
9	to everybody? What will happen next?
10	MR. PHILLIPS: Okay, let me explain let me
11	just have a little side conversation for a second. We are
12	setting up a Web site. I can show you the Web site that we
13	currently have, but it's not the one we are going to
14	eventually have. But it's part of your overhead.
15	This is the Web site where you will see
16	materials. Like for example, the transcript from the meeting
17	today will be on that Web site. But later we are going to
18	change it to something like .gov, let's say OERI.national
19	test, something like that.
20	MR. SMITH: Will we be able to hot link?
21	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.
22	MS CHANG: And I hope, I'm sure you are aware

1	that the contracts have a Web site also, and I hope that I
2	will be able to link to this, the one OERI sets up and that be
3	the main one, but there will be a link from ours also.
4	MR. PHILLIPS: Now, we also will eventually
5	we are trying to decide internally, there will be a contact
6	person for this. So that if you want to write or call, there
7	will be a person you can write to or call and get information.
8	Until we get that person, I'll give you my number, (202) 219-
9	1763, or our Web is www no that's not it
10	www.gary_phillips.ed.gov.
11	MS CHANG: Please keep feeding your technical
12	type questions to Gary.
13	MR. PHILLIPS: And if, you know, if you have
14	other issues I can pass them on to the right, to the perfect
15	person, be it a legal or contractual or whatever. If you
16	can't get in touch with the right person, give it to me and
17	I'll make sure it gets to the right person.
18	MR. MINCHEW: And questions that are asked, are
19	you going to make them up on the Web or are you going to
20	distribute them to the people who were here? What are you
21	going to do?
22	MR. PHILLIPS: I think, the way we've done this

1	in the past if they are related to the RFP they go to public
2	knowledge. If they are things like how are you doing today,
3	you know, if they are unrelated to this, then they would not
4	be. But probably most of what you have to say is going to be
5	related to the RFP.
6	MR. MINCHEW: The process would be are you going
7	to put it on the Web or are you going to distribute it to a
8	list serve, or what?
9	MS CHANG: I'm not sure. I'm taking your
10	comments as others are here in the room. And some of these
11	probably will be answered in the RFP. And if you presented
12	another question, we might not send you back an answer, but we
13	may incorporate it in our statement or a special clause or
14	that kind of things as a way of answering it. And we also hope
15	to have a draft statement of work, I hope with that that you
16	will be able to put some of the special things that we intend
17	to write about inclusion in that and put those up as special
18	clauses and then would welcome your comments back to that. If
19	you would see that we had changed your wording when we issued
20	the final, that type of thing.
21	MR. MINCHEW: But suppose George answered the
22	question that I might have on a view on. I'm not going to be

1	able to get my view to you, not knowing when George's
2	question. I'm just asking, I'm not advocating.
3	MS CHANG: I'm not sure that we've thought that
4	far out.
5	MR. PHILLIPS: In terms of like if you write to
6	me and ask a question, I cannot give you an individual any
7	information I don't give to everyone. So as a general rule I
8	would err on the side of making whatever question, whatever
9	answer I give you available to everybody. I don't know about
10	questions. If somebody asked a question, that doesn't, I'm
11	assuming, have to be made available to everybody. But the
12	answer does. And so, we are real sensitive about that. And
13	so, I think you need to be assured that if you ask something,
L4	even a phone call. If you make a phone call about this RFP,
15	if you call me up and ask me a question, I won't answer it
16	unless I am prepared to let everybody know the answer to that
17	question.
18	MR. MINCHEW: I understand all that. My
19	question is where do, how do we get that information? Do you
20	want us to go to the Web or are you going to send it to us?
21	Do we look for it
22	MR. PHILLIPS: It will be on the Web site.

1	MR. MINCHEW: Okay.
2	MR. PHILLIPS: The Web site right here. But we
3	are going to be changing the name eventually to this, but you
4	will still be able to find it. This is in the Department of
5	Education Web site. This particular address gets you right to
6	this material. But later it will be, I think, we will have a
7	more understandable address, we just don't have it yet.
8	MR. OSWALD: If you answer a question that's
9	been asked and it becomes public question and answer, does the
10	identity of the asker of the question also become public
11	information?
12	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, yes. That's the way we
13	routinely handle contracts when we are in the phase where
14	we are about to go out with an RFP and that's known, then we
15	get into a mode where we are very conservative and err on the
16	side of maximum information for everybody.
17	MS KOLE: What Gary is trying to say is any
18	follow-up conversation that goes on after this meeting is
19	going to be treated the same way that this meeting has been
20	treated. It goes out in the public domain and it's publicly
21	available to everybody involved, so nobody has any

1	comments or	advice? Rea	ally, this	has been	tremendous,	, it			
2	really has.	Covered the	whole rang	e, the wl	hole gamut,	very			
3	much appreciate it.								
4	Well, thank you very much.								
5		(Whereupon,	the above	matter w	vas concluded	d at			
6	12:30 p.m.)								
7									